BOHN'S ANTIQUARIAN LIBRARY.

ORDERICUS VITALIS.

THE

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF

ENGLAND AND NORMANDY.

BY

ORDERICUS VITALIS.

TRANSLATED, WITH NOTES,

AND THE INTRODUCTION OF GUIZOT,

By THOMAS FORESTER, M.A.

PROPERTY OF THE MERCANTILE LIBRARY BROOKLYN

BROOKLYN

BUC LIBRA

VOL. III.

M 201774

LONDON:

HENRY G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

MDCCCLIV.

274
965
v.3

J. HADDON AND SON, PRINTERS, CASTLE STREET, FINSBURY.

3435,47
v.3

THE

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF

ORDERICUS VITALIS.

BOOK VIII.

Ch. XIX. *Prince Henry obtains possession of the castle of Domfront—Singular escape of a prisoner from the dungeon.*

In the year of our Lord 1092, the fifteenth indiction, Henry, son of King William, by God's help and the support of his friends, obtained possession of the castle of Domfront, and began from thence to urge strong claims to his hereditary rights. This prince, being the youngest, did not receive fraternal treatment from his brothers, but was compelled to seek the aid of foreigners, such as the French and Bretons, as if he had been himself an alien, and was harassed by many vicissitudes of fortune during five years.[1] At length, by God's providence, the inhabitants of Domfront, pitying the misfortunes of the illustrious exile, sent one Harecher[2] to invite him out of France, and, giving him

[1] Reckoning from the death of William the Conqueror.

[2] "This person," says M. Le Prevost, "was not called Harecher, but Achard." Mr. Stapleton thinks that our author was correct in writing it *Harecherius*, and considers that word synonymous with *Archarius*, which frequently appears in the Rolls of the Exchequer. We find there a Richard *Archarius*, or Archer, and a Richard de Domfront, whom he considers the same person. This inhabitant of Domfront received from the gratitude of Henry I. seven manors in Berkshire. This grant is made to him under the name of Robert the Archer, and Henry calls him *magister meus*. Wace, who calls him Haschier, adds that it was to Paris he went to give the invitation to the young prince. He was descended from another Achard, who appears as witness to the charter of foundation of Lonlai in 1026, with this description: *Achardus dives, miles de Donnifronte.*

an honourable reception, threw off the yoke of Robert de Belèsme, by whom they had been long grievously oppressed, and declared Henry their lord. The prince forthwith took arms against Robert, count of Normandy, and made reprisals for his own banishment by pillaging and burning the country; taking many captives, and throwing them into prison. Among these was a man named Rualed from the territories of St. Evroult, who was lodged in the castle of Domfront. The prisoner, sitting by the fireside, for it was in the winter, began to invoke St. Evroult in his tribulation, thus addressing him: "I beseech thee, holy Evroult, the friend of God, to deliver me from this captivity. Thou knowest that I have always served thee faithfully." Having said this, he suddenly fell asleep, when, lo! he felt some one take his hand and begin to pull him. Upon his waking, he found himself entirely free from pain, for he was so feeble that he could not walk without some one's help, having received injury by falling from the horse on which he was bound. He began now to consider what he could do to escape from his prison. He had noticed that the knight who brought him there had firmly closed the gate which led to the garden with a bolt. But faith giving him courage, he approached the gate and seized the bar which fastened it, when, strange to say, the bolt, which was so strongly fixed, fell to the ground. Having opened the gate, he proceeded to the end of the little garden, but on arriving there he saw a number of soldiers standing in the courtyard. However, he stretched out his hand, saying, "St. Evroult, be my guide," and so, with bare feet and having only his shirt and cloak on, passed through the crowd of soldiers, as if they had lost their sight. None of them asked who he was, or whither he was going. I think that they were prevented seeing him by the power of the most blessed saint. About six o'clock, the fugitive, looking back, perceived the knight who had made him prisoner galloping after him; whereupon, being much terrified, he concealed himself in a thicket of underwood, which happened to be in sight. The knight riding up to the spot, inquired of some husbandmen who were ploughing a neighbouring field, if they had seen any one running that way, but they, fear putting them on their guard, denied having noticed any one, although they had

seen him well enough. The knight having left the spot, the captive rose from his lurking place, and, with the help of God and St. Evroult, reached his home in safety, where he lived till my time. I heard what I have related from his own mouth, and as he was an honest and worthy man, I have no scruple in crediting it.

CH. XX. *Philip I. of France carries off and marries Bertrade, wife of the count of Anjou, repudiating his queen Bertha—He is excommunicated—Philip and Bertrade reconciled to the count—His children—List of French bishops.*

ABOUT this time a disgraceful and troublesome affair happened in France. Bertrade, countess of Anjou, apprehensive that her husband would treat her as he had done two other wives, and abandon her to shame like a vile harlot, in the conscious pride of her high birth and great beauty, sent a confidential messenger to Philip, king of France, disclosing to him what was passing in her mind. She preferred leaving her husband voluntarily, and taking another, to being repudiated by him and exposed to contempt. The dissolute king, on learning the lascivious woman's desires, consented to her proposals, and received her on her arrival in France, after having escaped from her husband, with open arms.[1] In short, he divorced his noble and excellent wife Bertha,[2] daughter of Florence, duke of Frisia, who had borne him two children, Lewis[3] and Constance, and married Bertrade, who had lived nearly four years with Fulk of Anjou.[4] Odo, bishop of Bayeux, celebrated this execrable marriage,[5] and received from the adulterous king the churches

[1] Bertrade withdrew privately from the church of St. John at Tours during the ceremony of consecrating the holy water on Saturday, June 4, 1093, and hastened to join the king who was waiting for her at a short distance.

[2] Bertha, daughter of Florence, count of Holland, and Gertrude of Saxony, was married to Philip about the year 1072.

[3] Lewis the Fat.

[4] In 1089.

[5] It is not exactly known who celebrated this marriage. According to William of Malmesbury it was William Bonne-Ame, archbishop of Rouen, which might account for his suspension by Pascal II. This solution would be perfectly satisfactory, were it not for the long interval which elapsed between the fault and its punishment, very different from the practice of

of the city of Mantes, which he held for some time as the reward of his ill-omened service. No French bishop could be persuaded to consecrate so detestable an union, but, adhering to the rules of ecclesiastical discipline, they all chose to please God rather than man, and concurred in one universal anathema against the shameful marriage. Thus the bold harlot left one adulterous husband, the count of Anjou, and clung to another, the king of France, to the hour of his death. Thus, alas! the throne of France was disgraced by the abominable sin of adultery, and violent threats and great preparations for war between these powerful rivals were the consequence. But the feud between them was allayed by the dexterity of female cunning, Bertrade's ready wit finding means to effect a reconciliation so perfect that she brought them together at a splendid banquet,[1] in which she served them with her own hands with consummate grace, to their great satisfaction.[2] Pope Urban sent legates from the apostolical see into France, and both by letters and the remonstrances of the priests, rebuked the erring king, censuring him severely for having repudiated his lawful wife, and united himself to an adulteress, against the laws of God.[3]

the court of Rome at this period. On the other hand it is not more easy to explain the pope's indulgence to the bishop of Bayeux, if he was the guilty person. But Urban II., in a letter to Reynold, archbishop of Rheims, describes this marriage ceremony to have been performed by Ursion, bishop of Senlis. In that case we may suppose that the archbishop of Rouen, and bishop of Bayeux, only sanctioned it with their presence.

[1] *Ambosque simul ad mensam discumbere faceret et nocte sequenti ambobus in unâ conclavi stratâ præpararet.* This curious addition is supplied by the MS. which belonged to Christina, queen of Sweden.

[2] The count of Anjou, whose indignation was at first exhibited in the grossest manner, treated the affair, in the end, very differently. Philip and Bertrade paid him a visit at Angers on Wednesday, October 6, 1106, and were received by him with great honours, in which not only the laity, but, what is more extraordinary, the clergy, took part. M. Le Prevost, however, is of opinion that Bertrade did not descend from her royal dignity to serve at table the vassal she honoured with a visit; and he observes that there is no other instance of a queen of France having given such service, even to her husband.

[3] The first excommunication against the adulterers was pronounced at the council of Autun (October 16, 1094) by Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, legate of the holy see; and the second at the council of Clermont (Nov. 18—26, 1095) by Urban II. in person. It was removed by the same pope at the council of Nismes (beginning of July, 1096), on the promise made by Philip to repudiate Bertrade, and again issued by the two legates

But King Philip, hardened in his iniquity, and like the deaf adder which shuts her ears to the voice of the charmer, treated with contempt the exhortations of the fathers who corrected him, and remained sunk in the foul pit of adultery for a long period; two sons, Philip and Florus,[1] being the fruit of this illicit intercourse. He was therefore placed under an interdict for nearly fifteen years, while Urban and Paschal were popes of Rome.[2] During all this time, he never wore his crown or royal robes, nor celebrated any festival in kingly state. Wherever he went, in every city and town of France, as soon as the clergy received intelligence of his arrival, the bells ceased to be rung, and the regular chants of the clergy were suspended. In consequence there was general mourning, and divine worship was performed in private as long as the princely sinner sojourned in the diocese. However, in deference to his royal dignity and by licence from the bishops, whose sovereign he was, a chaplain was allowed him, by whom he heard mass performed with his household.

About this time France was famous for several pious and learned bishops. The aged Leuter[3] filled the metropolitan see of Bourges, and Daimbert that of Sens.[4] The illustrious Reynold was archbishop of Rheims,[5] and at his death was succeeded by Ralph, surnamed Le Vera.[6] The learned Ives

at the council of Poitiers, the 18th of November, 1100. Nothwithstanding the promise of separation given at the council of Beaugenci (July 30, 1104), absolution was not renewed until the fourteenth council of Paris (Dec. 2, 1110), where the promise was confirmed on oath.

[1] Philip, count of Mantes, and lord of Meun in Berri. Florus (Fleuri) married the heiress of Nangis. To these must be added Cecilia, first married to the famous Tancred, and afterwards to Pons, count of Tripoli.

[2] Without even counting the period during which the excommunication was suspended, our author commits an error of nearly four years.

[3] Read Leodegar, 1097—March 31, 1120.

[4] March, 1098—November 28, 1122.

[5] Reynold du Bellai, archbishop of Rheims, 1083—January 21, 1096.

[6] Ralph Le Vert, archbishop of Rheims, October 25, 1108—July 23, 1124. It is singular that our author should omit in this enumeration Manasses, the pious and learned archbishop of Rheims, who filled the see between Reynold du Bellai and Ralph Le Vert. Gregory VII. called him, long before he was a bishop, his beloved in Christ Jesus, and gives him the title of zealous defender of the catholic faith. Manasses, the second of that name, of the house of Châtillon, flourished 1046—Sept. 18, 1106.

was bishop of Chartres,[1] to whose merits a good life and sound doctrine bore clear testimony. Walo was bishop of Paris;[2] and other bishops were eminent in their several dioceses, whose piety and holy teaching filled France with joy. King Philip, however, obstinately rejected their exhortations that he should amend his life; and, contaminated by his adultery, persisted in his crime, so that he was deservedly afflicted with tooth-ache and scurvy, and many other infirmities and ignominies.[3] In consequence, with the consent of the French, he gave up to his son, Lewis, Pontois, Mantes, and the whole county of the Vexin, with the entire administration of the affairs of the kingdom, at a time when he had scarcely reached the age of manhood.[4] He espoused his daughter to Hugh, count of Troyes, and she was afterwards married at Chartres to Bohemond, the illustrious duke of Antioch. This duke came to France in the year of our Lord 1106, and was everywhere received by the nations of the west as the principal standard-bearer of the forces of Christendom. Constance, the king's daughter, accompanied him on his return to the East, and many thousands of the people of the West enlisted under his command in the wars against the Infidels.[5] But that Crusade did not in all things turn out as they expected.

Ch. XXI. *A legend of some extraordinary appearances in the church of St. Peter at Coutances.*

In the year of our Lord 1108,[6] the first indiction, William

[1] Ives, bishop of Chartres, end of November, 1091—December 23, 1116.

[2] Walo or Galo, bishop of Paris, 1105—February 23, 1116.

[3] M. Le Prevost remarks, that Ordericus is the only writer who mentions these two chastisements of the divine wrath. Toothache, he says, is too common a pain (at least in our days) for us to look to so high a quarter for its infliction, and there is some difficulty in believing that a king of France, even so little exemplary as Philip I., could have been subject to the disgusting disease which our author attributes to him.

[4] The exact time at which Lewis the Fat was associated in the government is not known. This prince, so different from his father, displayed so much activity, that he had the surname of *Non Dormiens*, The Sleepless.

[5] See before, vol. ii. p. 223.

[6] It is impossible to account for our author's abruptly stopping the course of his narrative to introduce a legend so little worthy of finding a place in serious history as the account of the prodigy given in this chapter.

the archbishop[1] assembled a synod of bishops and abbots at Rouen, and during several days held consultations with his suffragans on urgent ecclesiastical affairs. At that time Ralph, bishop of Coutances,[2] came to the lodgings of Serlo, bishop of Séez, who was the wiser of the two, and conversing with him on various subjects, received full explanations. At last, among other things, the bishop of Coutances said: "We have in our city a church built in ancient times, and dedicated to St. Peter the Apostle,[3] where many miracles were formerly wrought by divine power. Health was frequently restored to the sick, and lighted candles were often seen to fall from on high. A certain nun, who passed for being eminently pious, daily frequents this church, and relates that she was a constant witness of these prodigies. In order to furnish an undoubted proof of her story, on one occasion, when she was keeping solitary watch in a chapel [within the church], and she saw a lighted candle let down from above without human aid, she reverently approached the high altar, and extinguishing the candle, wrapped it in a clean napkin, and deposited it in her chest. At a suitable time she told what she had seen, and opened her chest to exhibit the token, but she found only ashes to show that the candle had been lighted, for it was entirely burnt out without injury to the napkin and other things contained in the chest.

Lately, also, while the people were celebrating the feast of St. Peter the Apostle in the same church, and the clergy assembled in the choir were performing vespers, all present saw three wax candles, burning brightly, descend from above upon the altar, and were struck with wonder at so strange a prodigy. The candles burned until the end of matins, and were not entirely consumed until the dawn of day. The tapers stood in due order upon the altar, but did not touch the altar cloth. The centre one was large and square, the two others were less and round. The news of this occurrence was spread throughout the city, and almost all the

[1] William Bonne-Ame, archbishop of Rouen, July, 1079—February 9, 1110.

[2] Ralph, bishop of Coutances, April 3, 1093—1110.

[3] There is still a parish church of this name at Coutances, to the south of the cathedral.

clergy and laity flocked after vespers were over to see the extraordinary spectacle. No one ventured to touch the candles, but on the square one the clerks read the following writing: on the first side, "Send, Peter, wrath from heaven;" on the second, ". . . .[1] the people from sin;" on the third, "Have mercy on them;" on the fourth, "Tears." The letters were well formed and could be read with ease, and the learned carefully inquired the meaning of the inscription; and, adding words understood, which were necessary to complete the sense, they interpreted it according to the best of their judgment. It appeared to them that God thus spoke to Peter, who is the governor of the earth, the judge of the world, and the bearer of the keys of the celestial kingdom: "Peter, send thy wrath from heaven, that it may be poured forth on the . . . people (that is, the people totally lost in sin). I should have mercy on them if they offered me the tears of a true penitence." The words of God, indeed, are not subject to the rules of grammar, and cannot be forced to follow the idioms of human language. We have been much terrified at Coutances by this revelation; and feel that perils are impending over us in these plagues and storms of war, and are apprehensive that still worse may happen in future."

Ralph, bishop of Coutances, relating this story, his hearers were struck with astonishment, and soon afterwards many calamities ensued from wars, and tempests, and famine. The bishop himself died soon afterwards, and a destructive pestilence raged throughout his diocese.

CH. XXII. *Rupture with Malcolm, king of Scots—and the expedition of William Rufus to the borders—Peace made by the mediation of Robert Curthose—Death of Malcolm and Queen Margaret—Affairs of Scotland—Disputed succession to the throne.*

IN the year of our Lord 1089, the tenth indiction, the venerable Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, departed this life, and the estates belonging to the metropolitan see

[1] *Tarisum*, a word perfectly unintelligible, is found in the text; but the bishop of Coutances informs us, a few lines afterwards, that divine revelations are not to be subjected either to rules of grammar or language.

were treated for three years as part of the royal domains. At last, the blessed Anselm, abbot of Bec, by God's providence, was appointed his successor, and governed the church seventeen years, during which he suffered severe trouble and adversity.

At that time much wickedness began to prevail, and greatly increased in violence. The men attached to military service first set the example of departing from the habits of their fathers in their dress and manner of wearing the hair, which was soon followed by the burghers and country folk, and almost all the common people. Offences against the laws of God becoming flagrant, the divine judgments severely punished the guilty with a variety of calamities which they well merited.

At that time,[1] Malcolm, king of Scotland, revolted against the king of England, and refused to render him the homage he owed him. But King William having, as before related, been reconciled with his brother Robert in Normandy, he brought him over on his return to make head against the faithless traitors who had conspired against their royal master. Assembling the whole military force of England,[2] he led them as far as the great river which is called in the Scottish tongue, Watra;[3] but finding it impossible to cross, he encamped on the shore. The king of Scots held the other bank with his troops ready for battle, and sent envoys with this message to the king of England: "King William, I owe you nothing except war, if you provoke me to it by your outrages. But if I see Robert, the eldest son of the late King William, I am ready to pay him the homage which is due to him." This message being delivered, a council was held, in consequence of which Duke Robert crossed

[1] During the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, May 24, 1089—Dec. 4, 1092. The invasion of Northumberland by Malcolm occurred in the month of May, 1091.

[2] It was in the month of September that William Rufus and his brother, the duke, undertook the expedition against the Scots. A considerable fleet, which sailed before Michaelmas, and was to have acted in concert, was shipwrecked, and a number of knights perished by cold and hunger.

[3] The Water. It is evident that the Firth of Forth is meant. The disaster mentioned in the preceding note probably deprived the king of the means of transporting his army across the Firth, and disposed him to amicably adjust the quarrel.

over with a small retinue.[1] The king of Scots received him with great courtesy, and entertained him amicably three days. He then conducted the duke to the top of a lofty hill, from whence, on a plain below, a large body of men was to be seen; he then led him to a spot between two hills, and pointed out a still larger army on the level ground. "Supported," he said, "by these numerous bands of my Scottish subjects, I am prepared to give a good reception to your brother, if he dares to cross over the Firth. I wish he may attack us, that he may feel the points of our spears. I am willing to confess that when King Edward gave me his niece Margaret in marriage, he conferred on me the county of Lothian.[2] King William afterwards confirmed what his predecessor had granted, and commended me to you as his eldest son. The engagements made with you I am ready to keep, but I promised nothing and I owe nothing to your brother. 'No man,' as Christ says, 'can serve two masters.'" Robert replied, "What you say is true; but there have been changes in the state of affairs, and my father's former arrangements have been much shaken. Now, therefore, illustrious king, be persuaded by me; return with me to my brother, and you will receive from him kindness and many benefits; he is a nearer neighbour to you, and more powerful and rich than I am." The king of Scots trusted in these promises, and having had several conferences with William Rufus, made peace with him. Having disbanded

[1] The Saxon Chronicle associates Edgar Atheling in this mediation with Malcolm, his brother-in-law, at whose court he had taken refuge when William Rufus seized the domains in Normandy granted him by Robert Curthose. The duke also at this time reconciled the king to Edgar. Robert quitted England on the 23rd of December, in great dudgeon at his brother's refusal to perform the conditions of their treaty.

Though the name of Lothian is now restricted to some fertile districts in the south of Scotland, all the country between the Tweed and the Firth of Forth was so called in early times. It was formerly held under the crown of England, and formed during the Heptarchy part of the kingdom of Northumbria. The union of this part of Scotland with England, as well as its being held in fealty by the kings of Scots, commenced as early as the reign of King Edgar (956—975). The Firth of Forth, mentioned in a preceding note, was the proper boundary between the two kingdoms. The Saxon Chronicle, in recording the transactions of this year (1091), says, "Malcolm went with his army out of Scotland into *Lodene or Lothene* in England."

their armies, the two kings then departed for England together.[1]

After a time, King Malcolm wishing to return to his own kingdom, and having received magnificent presents from King William,[2] he was met on the road near the borders by Robert de Mowbray and his nephew Morel with some men-at-arms, who lay in ambush for him, and murdered him.[3] The king of England and his great nobles hearing of this, were deeply distressed, being ashamed that so foul and cruel a deed should be done by Normans. An old crime was renewed in modern times, for as Abner son of Ner, returning in peace from David's house, was treacherously slain by Joash and Abisha, so King Malcolm peaceably returning from the court of King William, was assasinated by the family of Mowbray.

Margaret, the queen of Scotland, alarmed at the distressing intelligence conveyed to her of her husband's death, summoned an assembly of all the great men of her realm, and presenting to them her sons Edgar, Alexander, and David,[4] entreated them to give them the honours due to the king's sons. The council receiving her supplication with great favour, she ordered great numbers of the poor to be assembled, and distributed among them all her treasures, for the love of God, beseeching them all to pray earnestly to the Lord for her own and her children's welfare, and for the

[1] The two kings again swore to their treaty of peace at Gloucester on St. Bartholomew's day, the 24th of August, 1092.

[2] William of Malmesbury says that Malcolm got nothing from the king of England but a safe conduct to return to Scotland, p. 333 in *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.*

[3] Malcolm was not assassinated on his journey home on the present occasion, but on the 13th of November, 1093, St. Brice's day, near the river Alne, while, irritated at the way in which he had been treated at Gloucester, he was returning for the third time to ravage England. His eldest son, Edward, reached Scotland, though he had received severe wounds at the same time, of which he died three days afterwards. Morcar, their assassin, was viscount of Northumberland, and in that capacity generally resided at Alnwick, which probably gave rise to the account that Malcolm had laid siege to that place. It appears that he fell victim to an ambuscade, and Morcar surprised him unarmed. His corpse would have remained unburied if two countrymen had not conveyed it to Tynemouth, and interred it there.

[4] Edward, the eldest son, was mortally wounded at the same time as his father, as mentioned in the preceding note.

soul of her husband. Margaret was daughter of Edward king of Hungary, who was son of Edmund, surnamed Ironsides, brother of Edward, king of England; the exiled Edward having married the daughter of Solomon, king of Hungary, and ascended the throne in right of her.[1] This distinguished princess, descended from a long line of kings, was still more eminent for her great worth and the sanctity of her life. Having arranged the affairs of state, and distributed her wealth to the poor, she entered a church and commanded her chaplains to celebrate mass. Having devoutly assisted at the holy office, and received herself the consecrated host, she expired before the prayers were ended.[2]

Among the other good deeds of this illustrious lady, she restored the monastry of Iona,[3] which Columba, the servant of Christ, erected in the time of Brute, son of Meilocon king of the Picts; it had fallen to ruin in the storms of war and the lapse of ages, but this Christian queen rebuilt it, and placed in it monks, with an endowment for performing the Lord's work.

She had entrusted her two daughters Edith and Mary, to

[1] See vol. i. p. 147.

[2] Queen Margaret died three days after her husband, the 16th of November. She was canonized in 1251; her feast was kept on the 10th of June.

[3] The celebrated monastery of Iona, more anciently called I, or Hii, and afterwards I-Comb-Kill, one of the Hebrides, was founded by St. Columba towards the end of the sixth century. He began his mission from Ireland, A.D. 565; *Bede's Eccl. Hist. Antiq. Lib.* p. 113; Mr. Stephenson's calculations making it two years sooner. The island is very small, being only two miles long by one wide, and containing, according to the Saxon Chronicle, only five hides of land, enough to support five families. The venerable ruins of the monastery still attract tourists. The island of Iona was also called *Sodorensis*, a descriptive epithet borrowed from the Scandinavian language (*Sodor-inch*, the southern island), which was also applied to the whole group by its Norwegian conquerors, and even the Isle of Man was comprised in it. In consequence the bishop, who resided in the monastery of St. Columba, took the title of *episcopus Sodorensis*, or more rarely, *episcopus Manniæ et insularum*. This bishopric, founded by the Norwegians, was suffragan to the metropolitan see of Drontheim until, in 1260, Magnus IV. of Norway ceded these islands to Alexander III. king of Scotland. In the reign of Edward III. the Isle of Man was taken from the Scots, and raised to a kingdom, and the bishop became a suffragan of York. Every one knows that the bishop of Man takes the title of bishop of Sodor and Man.

her sister Christiana, a nun of the abbey of Ramsey,[1] to be brought up and instructed in sacred learning. They remained long with the nuns, among whom they were educated both in literature, and good principles and conduct, and becoming marriageable, these devout virgins still put their trust in God; for being orphans, having lost both their parents, and having no support from their brothers and other relations and friends, they found ready help in the merciful care of the all-disposing providence of God. Alan the Red, count of Brittany, demanded in marriage from king Rufus,[2] Matilda, who was before called Edith, but the union was prevented by his death. After that, William de Warrenne, earl of Surrey, made proposals for her,[3] but by God's will, she was reserved for a more illustrious union; for when Prince Henry ascended the throne of England, he married Matilda,[4] by whom he had William the Etheling,[5] and Matilda the empress.[6] Mary became the wife of Eustace, count of Boulogne, to whom she bore an only daughter, who was given to Stephen, earl of Morton, with her father's hereditary states.

[1] The abbey of Ramsey in Hampshire, founded in 907, by King Edgar. This princess took the veil about the year 1067, and died there in the odour of sanctity about 1100. She is sometimes called Christina by contemporary writers.

[2] Alan the Red, third son of Eudes, count of Brittany, and of Agnes of Cornouailles, died in 1089. As Malcolm was then living, it does not appear how Alan could have demanded his daughter in marriage from William Rufus.

[3] William de Warrenne, the second of that name, married Elizabeth de Vermandois, and died in 1118.

[4] Matilda was married to Henry I. the 11th of November, 1100, and died on the 1st of May, 1118. See the character and epitaph of this good queen in *Henry of Huntingdon's History*, pp. 246, 247, *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.*

[5] This title, which was especially appropriated by the Anglo-Saxons to the heir-apparent to the throne, seems to have been affected by the Norman princes. See note, vol. i. p. 147. William, the Etheling, perished by shipwreck. Matilda is better known as the Empress Maud, the pretender to the throne in the troublesome times of King Stephen.

[6] Mary of Scotland, the youngest daughter of Malcolm and Margaret, married Eustace, count de Boulogne. Their daughter Matilda, who conveyed that county to Stephen de Blois, afterwards king of England, died the 3rd of May, 1151, and was buried in the abbey of Feversham in Kent, which she founded jointly with her husband in 1048. Stephen, and their eldest son Eustace, were also interred there.

On the death of Malcolm, king of the Scots, great divisions arose among them, in reference to the succession to the crown. Edgar, the king's eldest son, assumed it as his lawful right, but Donald,[1] King Malcolm's brother, having usurped authority, opposed him with great cruelty, and at length the brave youth was murdered by his uncle. Alexander, however, his brother, slew Donald, and ascended the throne; being thus the avenger as well as the successor of his brother, he reigned for some years, and married a daughter of Henry, king of England, by a concubine.[2] On his death without issue, he left the kingdom to his brother David. Thus all the three brothers were successively kings of Scotland, being distinguished for their good conduct and love of God, and living worthily according to their circumstances as young princes, and men of the world.

David, the youngest of the three brothers, prudently escaping from the fierce attacks of the Scots, came to the court of Henry, king of England. While his countrymen were harassed with civil wars, and were destroying their own bowels with implacable rage, David remained constantly at his brother-in-law's court, and being educated with the young lords in the royal household, as he grew in years merited the intimate friendship of that wise and powerful king. He received from him the distinguished honour of knighthood, and gifts of every kind were heaped upon him. He married the daughter of Earl Waltheof, and Judith the king's cousin, and possessed the two counties of Northampton and Huntingdon, which Simon de Senlis held as earl in her right.[3] She bore him a son, named Henry, and two

[1] Donald-Bane usurped the throne on the death of Malcolm, but six months afterwards was driven from it by *Duncan*, who was probably Malcolm's eldest son by a former wife, Ingeburge, widow of Torfinn, earl of Orkney. Duncan was killed after a reign of eighteen months by the partisans of Donald, who again reigned till 1098. It was not till then that Edgar, the third son of Malcolm, showed himself on the borders with succours from William Rufus, and was immediately acknowledged by the Scots. Donald was thrown into prison, where he died shortly afterwards. Edgar died the 8th of January, 1107, without issue.

[2] Alexander, surnamed The Severe, succeeded Edgar, and married Sybille, natural daughter of Henry I. by Sybille Corbet.

[3] Simon bore the name of Senlis, not as count, but as having been born in that city, being a younger son of a person named Rondel-le-Riche. Having married Matilda, eldest daughter of Judith and Waltheof, he

daughters, Clarice and Hodierna. His eldest male offspring was barbarously murdered by the iron fingers of a wretch of a clerk, who for an abominable crime which he had perpetrated in Norway, was punished by a sentence of mutilation which deprived him of his eyes, and his hands, and feet In his own country he had plunged a long knife into the bowels of a priest who was celebrating mass, just after he had received the host, and the people were departing; so that the priest fell dead, and his intestines were horribly exposed before the altar. This ruffian was afterwards housed by Earl David in England, for the love of God, and, with his little daughter, sufficiently supplied with food and clothes, yet he cruelly tore with the iron fingers which he used because he was maimed, the bowels of the young son of his benefactor, only two years old, pretending to caress Him; and thus, at the devil's instigation, suddenly scattered the intestines on the lap of the nurse who was suckling the child. Such was the end of the eldest of David's offspring. The wretched clerk was bound to the tails of four unbroken colts, and torn to pieces as they dashed asunder, to strike murderers with terror.[1]

In the year of our Lord 1125, Alexander, king of the Scots, died, and David his brother ascended the throne.[2] However Malcolm, a bastard son of Alexander, attempted to deprive his uncle of the crown, and involved him in two rather severe contests, but David, who was his superior in

assumed the English title of earl, in her right, in respect of the counties of Huntingdon and Northampton. He died at Charité-sur-Loire, on his return from the Holy Land.

Matilda was niece of Henry I., after the custom of Brittany. David of Scotland, her second husband, bereaved of her in 1131, was inconsolable for her loss. It appears by the Exchequer rolls that this prince retained the possession of the earldoms of Huntingdon and Northampton as long as he lived, though by right they ought to have passed to Simon de Senlis, the son, on the death of his mother, Queen Matilda.

[1] There seems no reason to doubt the truth of these accounts, although the wretched Scottish historians who were contemporary with these events omit all notice of them, and mention no other issue of his but Prince Henry, who died before him in 1152. David himself was found dead, in the attitude of prayer, on the 24th of May, 1153.

[2] It was in the year 1024 (April 24) that Alexander died, and was succeeded by his brother David.

talent, as well as in wealth and power, defeated him and his party.[1]

In the year of our Lord 1130, while King David was ably applying himself to a cause in King Henry's court, and carefully examining a charge of treason, which they say Geoffrey de Clinton[2] had been guilty of, Angus, earl of Moray, with Malcolm and five thousand armed men, entered Scotland with the intention of reducing the whole kingdom to subjection. Upon this, Edward, the son of Siward earl of Mercia, in the time of King Edward,[3] who was a cousin of King David and commander of his army, assembled troops and suddenly threw himself in the enemy's way. A battle was at length fought, in which Earl Angus was slain, and his troops defeated, taken prisoners, or put to flight. Vigorously pursuing the fugitives with his soldiers elated with victory, and entering Moray,[4] now deprived of its lord and protector, he obtained, by God's help, possesion of the whole of that

[1] Malcolm Macbeth was not a son of Alexander, but called himself the son of Angus, who will be mentioned in a succeeding note; but his origin is really unknown. It does not appear that he raised the standard of rebellion more than once, on which occasion he assumed the name of Wimund, as well as the quality of son of Angus. It is not, however, impossible that there may have been another Malcolm, a natural son of King Alexander, but not this Malcolm Macbeth, who caused troubles in Scotland at the commencement of his uncle's reign, as our author relates, but we have no other account of him.

[2] Roger de Hoveden places this trial at Woodstock, where the king kept the feast of Easter, and not in 1130, but in 1131. The rolls of the Exchequer, however, for 1130 contain an account of the disbursements for King David's journey to England and return.

[3] Siward Barn, Edward's father, has been already mentioned, pp. 4 and 198 of the second volume. The word barn, *beorn*, was a title of honour among the Anglo-Saxons somewhat corresponding to that of *child*, rendered in Latin *clito*, a prince. The relationship between Edward and King David, here referred to, has led to the supposition that Siward Barn was a younger son of Siward, earl of Northumberland and Huntingdon (Shakespeare's Siward, see before, vol. ii. p. 49), and David's great-uncle by his mother, sister of King Malcolm. Earl Waltheof (*ib.* 78, 84, 103) was Siward's eldest son, and this would explain his near relationship to the royal family of Scotland. His domains at Lechlade, in Gloucestershire, and in the isle of Axholm in Lincolnshire, were part of the territory of the ancient kingdom of Mercia.

[4] *Morafia;* formerly including not only Moray proper, or Elgin, but the county of Nairn and great part of Banff. It was also a bishopric.

large territory. Thus David's dominions were augmented, and his power was greater than that of any of his predecessors, while by his care Scotland became distinguished for the number of devout and learned men it possessed. I have somewhat prolonged this digression in consideration that the Scots adhered to the catholic faith from very ancient times,[1] and willingly practised Christian simplicity; but now I compel myself to return to the work I have in hand relative to our own country.

CH. XXIII. *Conspiracy of the Norman barons against the king—They revolt under Robert de Mowbray, earl of Northumberland—He is besieged in Bamborough castle—Made prisoner and confined for life—Punishment of the other conspirators.*

THE great body of the Normans who, becoming rich in England with wealth gained by the labours of others, were filled with arrogance, were still urged onward by the incentives of an insatiable avarice and pride. It was to them a source of envy and grief that William Rufus was distinguished for his courage and merit, and fearing no one, governed all his subjects with a firm hand. In their insolence they leagued together and formed a foul conspiracy against the king, and disregarding the fealty which they had sworn to their lord, fell into the disgraceful crime of treason.

Robert, son of Roger de Mowbray,[2] was distinguished for his great power and wealth; his bold spirit and military daring caused him to hold his fellow nobles in contempt, and inflated with empty pride he disdained obedience to his superiors. In person he was of great stature, size, and strength, of a dark complexion and covered with hair, his disposition bold and crafty, his features melancholy and harsh. He reflected more than he talked, and scarcely ever smiled when he was speaking. He possessed two hundred and eighty manors in England, which the great King William had granted to Geoffrey, bishop of Coutances. This bishop plumed himself upon his noble birth, and was more distinguished for military than clerical ability, better able to array armed

[1] Our author alludes to the pretensions of the church of Scotland to have received Christianity as early as the age of Pope Victor I., 193—202.

[2] Nephew of Geoffrey, bishop of Coutances.

soldiers for battle, than to teach cowled clerks in the chants of the church. He was therefore often engaged in the conflicts against the English and Danes, and when the enemy was subdued obtained vast possessions, which at his death he bequeathed to his nephew Robert, earl of Northumberland.[1]

In order to extend his territories, and that he might strengthen himself by alliances with the most powerful of his countrymen connected with him by ties of affinity, Robert married a noble lady who was daughter of Richard de Laigle,[2] and niece of Hugh, earl of Chester, by his sister Judith. He therefore took the lead among his fellow conspirators in a fruitless project, and broke into open rebellion.

Four large ships, called canards, sailed from Norway to England, and falling into the hands of Robert and his nephew Morel and their retainers, the peaceable merchants were stripped with violence of all they possessed. Having lost their goods, they went to court and in deep distress laid a complaint of their injuries before the king. William immediately commanded the earl in positive terms to restore to the merchants without delay all that he had abstracted from them; but the order was treated with supreme contempt. The generous king then caused an inquiry to be made of the amount of their losses, and made it good out of his own treasury.[3] He then summoned Robert to answer in his court, but he refused to attend.

The king being satisfied of the perverse temper of this fierce baron, collected troops and led a strong force against him. When he approached the borders of Robert's territories, Gilbert de Tunbridge,[4] a wealthy and powerful knight, drew

[1] Geoffrey de Mowbray died the 2nd of February, 1093.

[2] Matilda de Laigle, who was still living in 1130.

[3] A large share of the commerce of England had been in the hands of the Scandinavians, the great maritime power of the north of Europe, ever since their piratical enterprises had been exchanged for colonization in England. Their merchants were settled in London, Bristol, and other towns on the east and south coasts. In making this restitution, William Rufus, with a policy directed to the encouragement of trade which might not have been expected in a Norman sovereign, only adopted the principles of the enlightened maritime code of the Scandinavian nations, which enjoined it even in the case of losses by foreign merchants in consequence of shipwreck on their shores. See an essay *On the Danes in England*, in the Jubilee edition of King Alfred's works, and Warsaae's Danes, pp. 99, &c.

[4] Gilbert de Tunbridge, lord of Clare. His father, Richard de Bienfaite.

the king apart and falling at his feet, to his great astonishment, said: "I beseech you, my lord and king, to pardon my guilt, and I will reveal to you what greatly concerns your safety." The king being much surprised, hesitated a little while he deliberated in his own mind; at length he graciously pardoned the suppliant, and anxiously waited the fulfilment of his promise. Gilbert then said: "Stay your march, noble king, and do not enter this wood which lies before us. Your enemies lie in ambush in it well armed, with the design of killing you. We have conspired against you and have sworn to compass your death." On receiving this intelligence the king halted, and learnt from the baron's information who the traitors were.

Having outwitted the assasins who had undertaken to murder the king, the troops passed the ambuscade without molestation, and laid siege to the strong castle of Bamborough. That fortress being impregnable, the marshes and waters and other impediments to a march with which it is surrounded, rendering it inaccessible, the king caused a new fortification to be erected for the defence of the province and to shut in the enemy, and placed a garrison in it well supplied with arms and provisions. Those who were in the secret of the conspiracy and their partisans, fearing detection, observed silence, and in great alarm mingled with the royal troops and gladly entered the service of the man whose destruction they had planned. The king now held his troops ready for battle, and compelled his officers and the other English nobles to urge forward the works of the new fortification in which their people were employed with the utmost despatch; meanwhile Robert saw from his battlements, in deep tribulation, the works which were being carried on against him, and called loudly on his accomplices by name, publicly recommending them to adhere faithfully to their

also bore the surname of Tunbridge. It was one of the two under which he figured in Domesday-book, the other being Richard Fitz-Gilbert. Clare became ultimately the distinguishing name of the family. Baldwin Fitz-Gilbert was one of the barons who supported King Stephen, and addressed the troops as the king's deputy before the battle of Lincoln.—*Henry of Huntingdon*, p. 277, *Antiq. Lib.* Our author has related (vol. ii. p. 493) the tradition according to which the lordship of Tunbridge, given to Richard de Bienfaite as an equivalent for that of Brionne, was measured, acre for acre, with the latter.

traitorous league to which they had sworn.[1] The king and his faithful adherents only laughed at Robert's speeches, while the consciousness that their guilt was discovered, tormented the conspirators with fear and shame. The king having now returned to his court, confident of success, in order that he might prudently consult with his friends on the government of the kingdom, Robert de Mowbray, disgusted and wearied with the long blockade came out by night, and attempting to pass from one castle to another fell into the enemies' hands. Being taken prisoner by the king's troops, an end was put to the war, and Robert lived thirty years in confinement, and grew old while thus paying the penalty of his crimes.

Matilda his wife, who had never enjoyed happiness with him, because their union was contracted at the very moment of the insurrection, and she had been led to the nuptial couch only three months before, trembling amid the clash of arms, was soon deprived of the consolations of marriage, and long exposed to deep suffering. Her husband, as we said before, lived in prison, and during his life she could not according to the law of God marry again. At length, by licence from Pope Paschal,[2] before whom the case was

[1] Our author gives but an imperfect account of this rebellion, and of the vast conspiracy connected with it, for the purpose of placing Stephen d'Aumale on the throne, nor of the measures taken to stifle it. The king, after escaping the snare laid for him, took successively Newcastle and Tynemouth, making prisoners the brothers and bravest supporters of Robert de Mowbray, and then shut him up in Bamborough Castle, where he took refuge, building a fort opposite to it to shelter the besieging army, which he called Mal-Voisin. Having organized this system of blockade, the king crossed the Humber to wait the result. Robert, imprudently leaving his retreat, was pursued and obliged to throw himself into a monastery, where he made a desperate resistance during six days. At last he was wounded and taken prisoner. After Michaelmas the king, returning from his expedition into Wales, had his prisoner brought under the walls of Bamborough, where he was threatened with the loss of his eyes on the spot, if his countess and Morcal, who still held out, did not instantly capitulate. The threat having produced its effect, Robert was conducted to Windsor, where he was confined the rest of his life. These events took place in the year 1025, and, notwithstanding their importance, did not altogether withdraw the king's attention from the affairs of Normandy. Not being able to go there himself and scatter the seeds of treason and devastation, he committed the worthy undertaking to his brother, Prince Henry.

[2] Paschal II., Jan. 15, 1099—June 21, 1118.

laid by learned persons, after a long period, Nigel d'Aubigni[1] took her to wife, and for sometime treated her with respect, out of regard to her noble parents; but on the death of Gilbert de Laigle her brother,[2] Nigel craftily sought a ground of divorce, and repudiated her because she had been his cousin's wife, and he then married Gundrede, sister of Hugh de Gournai.[3] As for Morel, when his lord was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, he fled from England in great trouble, and wandering through many countries grew old in exile, poor and detested.

Exulting in his triumph over the rebels, the king rewarded his friends, brought the factious to justice, and on conviction punished them in various ways. He entirely disinherited Roger de Lacy,[4] expelled him from England, and gave his inheritance to his brother who had faithfully kept his fealty. Having had a private interview with Hugh, earl of Shrewsbury,[5] he rebuked him sharply, and, making him pay three thousand pounds, wisely restored him to favour. So in many other cases, he punished the malcontents by imposing on them fines of large amount, and out of regard for their relations who might make reprisals in Normandy, he prudently dissembled his wishes.

Then William d'Eu was publicly convicted of treason,

[1] Nigel d'Aubigni (near Périers), cousin and successor of Robert de Mowbray, was brother of William d'Aubigni, grand butler of William the Conqueror, the founder of the families of the earls of Arundel and Sussex of that name, both of which were descended from Roger d'Aubigni, who came over with the Conqueror, and his wife Avicia, who was probably aunt of Robert de Mowbray. The new earl of Northumberland was not distinguished for the purity of his morals, as one of his concubines figures in Domesday book. He died before the year 1130, when his son Roger de Mowbray was the king's ward as a minor.

[2] The time of his death is not exactly known, but it occurred before the year 1118.

[3] Gundrede survived her husband as well as Matilda de Laigle, his first wife, to whom the Danegeld, for her estates in the counties of Dorset and Stafford, was remitted in the year 1130. Gundrede was daughter of Gerard de Gournai and of Edith, sister of William de Warrenne, first earl of Surrey.

[4] He was son of Walter de Lacy, now called Lassi, on the road from Aulnai to Vire, who followed William the Conqueror to England, and was rewarded with the grant of more than 120 manors. We shall find him in 1102 at the head of the troops of Robert Curthose.

[5] Hugh de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury, second son of Roger de Montgomery and the countess Mabel.

and the king caused him to be deprived of sight and emasculated. This punishment was inflicted on him at the suggestion of Hugh, earl of Chester, whose sister he married, but was unfaithful to her having since the marriage had three children by a concubine.[1]

The earls and men of the highest rank were privy to and promoted the treasonable conspiracy, but when it was detected, on further consideration, they became ashamed of it, and the most powerful among them having been crushed, they were apprehensive that the like ruin might fall on themselves. The king adroitly discovered this, and consulting his counsel pardoned persons of that class. He was unwilling to bring them to a public trial, lest their exasperation should be increased, and they might be provoked to a general rising against the government, and much loss, destruction, and grief should be occasioned to the community.

CH. XXIV. *Distracted state of Normandy, principally caused by the ambition of Robert de Belèsme—His feuds with the neighbouring lords, cruelties and exactions.*

IN the year of our Lord 1094,[2] the rebellion in England was suppressed, and the authority of William in his father's kingdom was firmly established, with no one able to resist it. But Normandy was miserably disturbed, and its inhabitants exposed to alarms and commotions in every quarter, and Duke Robert, while insurrection was rife, was sunk in despicable sloth. At this time[3] sharp hostilities took place between William de Breteuil and Ascelin Goël, the origin of which was as follows. William, Goël's brother, a young knight, had insulted a female at Pacy; on her complaint William de Breteuil, as became a just lord, gave an equitable decision against the insolent young knight. Upon this

[1] William, second of the name, count d'Eu. The mutilation he suffered seems to have been more the result of an insulted wife's vengeance than a political punishment. It took place in 1096.

[2] This date is not exact; we have just seen that the rebellion and overthrow of Robert de Mowbray and the other conspirators occurred in the year 1095.

[3] These events having preceded and caused the hostilities between Ascelin Goël and William de Breteuil, already assigned to the month of February, 1092, we cannot place them in 1094.

Ascelin was incensed with his lord, because he had compelled his brother to answer the charge in public. Not long afterwards he seized the castle of Ivri by an ingenious stratagem, and gave it to Robert duke of Normandy, from whom William de Breteuil redeemed it for a large sum of money. In consequence of this enterprise there was a great feud between them, and each tried to injure the other.

In the month of February,[1] Ascelin called to his aid Richard de Montfort and the retainers of King Philip, and engaging in battle with William, his lord, who advanced against him, defeated him and made him a captive, putting his troops to flight with the loss of some who were taken prisoners. Elated with this victory, he became exceedingly arrogant, and cruelly tormented his lord and Roger de Glos and his other captives. He kept them in close confinement in his castle of Breval for three months, and often in the severest weather, during winter, exposed them in their shirts, well soaked in water, at a window in the highest stage of the tower to the blasts of the north or south winds, until their only covering was frozen into a sheet of ice round their bodies. At length, by the interference of friends, peace was concluded between them, and William was let out of prison on these conditions;—he gave his daughter Isabel in marriage to Goël, and delivered to him three thousand livres, with horses and arms and many other things, promising also to surrender the castle of Ivri.[2] On these terms William was liberated; but the peace was of short duration.

The year following,[3] William, who could never rest, renewed his hostilities, and established a fortified post with a garrison in the convent of monks which Robert d'Ivri had founded in honour of the Virgin Mary.[4] Upon this Goël who held the castle led a body of troops to the convent, now alas! become a den of thieves, and the summer heat, about Whitsuntide,[5]

[1] In the week between the 22nd and 29th Feb. 1092.

[2] See before, vol. ii. p. 484. William de Breteuil did more than promise the surrender of the castle of Ivri to Ascelin de Goël, he actually put him in possession of it. The fierce lord of Breval was not a man likely to be contented with empty promises.

[3] In 1093.

[4] The abbey of Ivri, founded in 1071 by Roger d'Ivri, cup-bearer to William the Conqueror, and son-in-law of Hugh de Grantmesnil.

[5] In 1095 Witsuntide fell on the 12th of May.

being excessive, in his sharp attack fire was thrown into the inclosure, and the church and dwellings of the monks, with their goods, became a prey to the destroying flames. On this occasion William Alis,[1] and Arnold son of Popelin,[2] and eight other soldiers were taken prisoners, who being thrown into Goël's dungeons, were a long time victims of his cruelty. William de Breteuil made his escape with some difficulty, and used every effort to revenge himself for his great losses. This powerful lord experienced the greatest indignation that his own vassal should make such aggressions on his territories, and that his means were so much augmented during three years by the ransoms of his captives and the pillage of the country people. At length he engaged to pay Philip, king of France, seven hundred livres, as well as large sums of money to Robert duke of Normandy, and many others, if they would faithfully succour him, and the enemy's forces were subdued.

In consequence, during Lent,[3] the king of France and the duke of Normandy laid siege to Breval, and assaulted it for nearly two months. The priests, with their parishioners, brought their banners, and the abbots assembling their vassals joined the besieging army.[4] At the same time Robert de Belèsme furnished a most ingenious machine such as his talent for engineering had invented at the siege of Jerusalem. He caused engines to be built which were impelled on wheels against the enemy's fortifications, he hurled vast stones as projectiles into the besieged place and among the garrison, instructed the besiegers in making assaults so as to destroy the trenches and the palisades surrounding a fortress, and to shatter the roofs of the houses upon the inhabitants, until overwhelmed with calamities, the enemy should be forced to surrender.

There was an old feud between Robert and Goël, arising out of former occasions of offence, and Robert, seeing that a

[1] William Alis, a vassal of the lords of Breteuil. This family gave its name to a mill situate in the domain of Breteuil. He is probably the same who appears as a *tenant in capite* in Domesday-book. See more of this person and his family, vol. ii. p. 191.

[2] Another vassal of the lords of Breteuil.

[3] During the Lent of the year 1094.

[4] There appears to have been a general levy en masse on this occasion.

fitting time for revenge was now come, assisted William de Breteuil with his counsels and his forces, more than all his fellows. Goël was a most desperate free-booter, daring and crafty, and a violater of churches. He had noble and brave kinsmen, by whose aid he had fortified the castle of Breval in an uninhabited forest country, and with their courage and succour he had manfully sustained the burden of such frequent hostilities. But now finding that so many great and valiant princes were firmly leagued against him, he sued for peace with his lord, who was also his father-in-law. His proposals were willingly acceded to by William de Breteuil, and in consequence Goël restored to him the castle of Ivri, which had so long been a cause of trouble to kings and dukes.

This is the famous castle, of great size and strongly fortified, which was built by Alberede wife of Ralph, count of Bayeux,[1] and which Hugh, bishop of Bayeux,[2] and brother of John, archbishop of Rouen held for a long time against all the efforts of the dukes of Normandy. It is said that Alberede, having completed this fortress with vast labour and expense, caused Lanfred, whose character as an architect transcended that of all the other French architects at that time, and who after building the castle of Pithiviers[3] was appointed master of these works, to be beheaded, that he might not erect a similar fortress any where else. She also, in the end, was put to death by her husband on account of this same castle of Ivri, having attempted to expel him from it.

How frequent are the revolutions of unstable fortune, and how constant are the changes and disturbances in the state of worldly affairs! The man is blinded by his folly, who sees such things passing under his observation, and does not reform his life, trusting in that which a turn of the wheel

[1] Aubrée, wife of Ralph, count of Evreux and Ivri, half-brother of Richard I. There is a charter of hers dated in 1011, in favour of St. Ouen at Rouen.

[2] Hugh, bishop of Bayeux, their eldest son.

[3] Built about the year 1190 by Avise or Helvise de Champagne, mother of Isembard, lord of Pithiviers, and of Odolric, bishop of Orleans, and Agnes mentioned in several charters.

will take from him. Man drives man to destruction,[1] and follows in the same track the enemy he has sent before him to the grave, while alas! he justly loses the opportunity of being able to benefit himself or others.

Peace having been restored between these stubborn combatants, much to the satisfaction of their neighbours, Robert de Belèsme only felt himself deeply aggrieved because he had not been invited to take part in the consultations, lest he should create difficulties, although he had taken the lead in the warlike preparations, in the hope that his fierce and determined enemy might be subdued and crushed. The skill and formidable power of Robert had given him the pre-eminence among the besiegers, and he had struck terror by his wonderful machines into the bold and crafty freebooter, who till that time had been used to laugh at kings and dukes in his secure retreat, and to mock the enemies he baffled by all sorts of manœuvres. This knight finding concord restored among such discordant elements, collected his forces without delay, and letting no one know his crafty design, made a hasty countermarch, and fell suddenly on Robert Giroie at St. Céneri.[2] The garrison of the castle, supposing that Robert was engaged with duke Robert in the general expedition against Breval, had gone forth from the place, and were scattered over the country in false security, according as each man's fancy led him. But when the wily master of stratagem suddenly appeared at the head of his troops, hoping by a sudden assault to effect an entrance into the castle and overpower those who were left within, by God's intervention Giroie was in time to meet the attack, having thrown himself and his retainers with great expedition into the place, so that Belèsme was greatly mortified at being foiled in his expectation of taking it by surprise. He then converted his enterprise into a predatory excursion, killing one soldier, and doing much damage. His mischievous and perfidious designs being thus discovered open hostilities ensued. Giroie had auxiliary support from

[1] *Mortalis mortalem in mortem impellit* an alliteration such as the writers of this age often indulged in.

[2] St. Céneri sur Sarthe.

Geoffrey de Mayenne, William de Sille,[1] and several other lords, and ravaged the whole country about Alençon for three months. At that time Henry, son of William the Great, king of England, possessed Domfront, and made war on Robert de Belèsme, from whom he had wrested that castle, as well as on the king and the duke, who had compelled him to become an exile from his native land.

In the beginning of the month of July, Robert Giroie, with Prince Henry's retainers and other troops, made an irruption into Belèsme's territories, and having swept off much booty, pursued the enemy at the head of his forces; but as he was conducting his allies towards their home, and, absorbed in cheerful conversation with his friends and acquaintance, accompanied them to some distance from St. Céneri, a sudden report was spread there that he was killed. Presently great lamentations and loud outcries were heard in the castle, the garrison were struck with terror, and lost their wits and powers of resistance. Paganus de Montdoubleau,[2] and Rotrou de Montfort,[3] and some others who were charged with its defence, abandoned the place; and, favouring Belèsme, as some say, left the castle without any one to guard it, though no person molested them. Radegunde, Giroie's wife, turned pale at the fearful rumour, but determined, while waiting for their confirmation, to remain in the castle with her attendants. What, however, could a lone woman do against stubborn men determined to have their own way. Meanwhile, Robert de Belèsme's attention was attracted by the disorderly shouts of those who were leaving the place, and immediately coming up and finding it deserted by its defenders, he easily forced an entrance, and, giving it up to pillage, then set fire to it. The assailants found within pots full of meat boiling on the fires, and the tables covered with cloths, and spread with dishes of food.

[1] Sillé-le-Guillaume, at equal distances between Alençon and Mayenne, took its surname from this lord or one of his predecessors of the same name. It must not be confounded with Silli-en-Gouffern, which must have belonged to some friend and vassal of Robert de Belèsme.

[2] Montdoubleau in the arrondissement of Vendôme, formerly belonging to Maine. This Paganus de Montdoubleau appears before, vol. ii. p. 455, where our author has written the name more correctly, *Mons-Dublelis*.

[3] Montfort-le-Rotrou, near Mans. It took its surname from the third son of Rotrou, count de Perche, one of the ancestors of this lord.

Some monks of Seéz removed the arm of St. Céneri from the church, and reverently translated it to their abbey of St. Martin. The rest of this saint's relics are preserved at Château Thierri, on the river Marne, and are venerated by the French with great devotion.

Meanwhile, Giroie had parted from his friends in high spirits, and was engaged in meditating, alas! in vain, on fresh inroads on his enemy's territories, when, as no human power is durable, he was suddenly shocked by the melancholy tidings he received. The noble knight had lost his inheritance by a sudden mischance, and was now compelled to seek an asylum among strangers. His wife, Radegunde, a prudent and excellent woman, died the same year, and their son William, a child, soon followed his mother to the grave. The boy was retained as a hostage by Robert de Belèsme, who, it is reported, caused him to be poisoned by Robert de Poillé.[1]

Overwhelmed by so many calamities, Giroie took refuge with his friends, and receiving comfort and aid from his kinsmen and associates, hope for the future sprung up in his mind. The year following he fortified a castle at Montagu,[2] and took fierce revenge on Robert de Belèsme, who, in great fury, hastened to the duke, and prevailed with him by his complaints and promises to invest the castle of Montagu with the forces of Normandy. Then Geoffrey of Mayenne, and other nobles of Maine, presented themselves to the duke, and with smooth words interceded on Giroie's behalf. They succeeded in obtaining from him the terms, that on his demolishing the castle he had lately erected, his whole inheritance should be restored to him in peace: which was done accordingly.

As the weather becoming fair, after violent storms, fills men with joy, so divine justice chastises the guilty, while mercy and loving kindness comforts the afflicted, sanctifies the penitent, and rewards them when cleansed from their sins.

Taught by his severe misfortunes, Giroie returned thanks to

[1] Probably Poillé in La Flèche. The name of Eudes de Poillé appears as witness to a charter of Robert de Belèsme, dated in 1092.

[2] *Monte Acuto.* See the note, vol. i. p. 393. But this castle is not situated near Bais, as there erroneously stated, but on the lands of La Pooté-des-Nids, half a league west of St. Céneri.

God, by whose aid after many trials he had recovered his ancient lordship; he lived nearly thirty years afterwards through many changes of fortune, good and bad. He married Felicia, daughter of Warner de Connéri,[1] who bore him three sons, and as many daughters; William, Robert, and Matthew; Agatha, Damata, and Aveline.

The count de Belèsme urged forward the demolition of the new castle, with all his influence, employing the peasants from all his own lordships and the neighbourhood in the compulsory duty[2] of working at its destruction. The vassals of St. Evreux took no part in this labour, because they owed no service to the count, upon which he was greatly incensed with the monks, and did them great injuries for a whole year. He compelled by violence the tenants of St. Evroult to work at the fortifications of his own castles, carrying off the goods of those who shrunk from the labour; and he even threatened to lay the abbey in ruins, unless they submitted to his will in all things as their lord. His fury at last grew to such a pitch, that he insolently ravaged all the domains belonging to the church in his neighbourhood. This so much impoverished the monks, that abbot Robert was compelled to implore assistance in England from King William, for the support of the poor brothers who were deprived of their necessary food by the tyrant's ravages. His hand was also cruelly heavy on other households of God who lived under him or in his neighbourhood, and he often destroyed them by inflicting losses and ill treatment on them without mercy. This is witnessed by the monks of Séez, Troarne, and Mans, who by his cruelties and exactions were frequently made to tremble with anger and grief.

Robert de Belèsme also grievously oppressed the bishopric of Séez against all right and justice, asserting that it was granted by Duke Richard to his grandfather William de Belèsme, on pretence of which he subjected its ecclesiastical

[1] A bourg in the department of the Sarthe. It appears that its present lord was not called Warner, but Avesguard de Connére. There is a charter of his in favour of St. Vincent at Mans, dated May 1, 1100, in which he mentions his wife Brille, and his daughter Felicia and Robert de Giroie his son-in-law.

[2] The corvée, that heavy burden on the French peasantry, under the feudal institutions, which was not abolished till the revolution.

possesions to many vexatious claims and much loss. In consequence, the venerable bishop Serlo excommunicated the count, and laid all his territories under an interdict, forbidding the offices of holy worship to be performed, or even the burial of the dead. However, Robert, who for his cruelty was justly surnamed Talvas,[1] hardening his heart like Pharaoh, was softened neither by the bishop's stripes or emollients, but went on daily adding to the number of his iniquities. Like Ishmael, he let loose his armed bands against all his neighbours, kept the monks and clergy and unarmed people in constant terror by his cruel tyranny, and miserably persecuted them by his frequent ravages and insults. In such times as those, the severest censure of the church could have no effect on a man who plumed himself on his secular power, and whose savage and infamous conduct rendered him insupportable to his associates, friends, and vassals. He thought little of depriving men of their sight, or mutilating them by amputating their hands or feet, but his great delight was, like Phalaris the Sicilian, to invent new and unheard-of modes of torturing his wretched victims. Those who were thrown into his dungeons on any charge he exposed to unutterable torments more cruel than Nero, Decius, or Diocletian, making their sufferings the subject of jest and laughter with his parasites.[2] He gloried in the pain he inflicted on his prisoners, and was well pleased to be accused of barbarity for the excessive rigour of his punishments, preferring the pleasure of so doing, to the increase of his treasures by permitting the ransom of his captives. Many, by God's help, escaped from his dungeons and afterwards took severe revenge for their sufferings, from whom, if he had been accessible to reason and touched with humanity, he might have received large sums and honourable services. The terror of multitudes, he was himself afraid of them, and he had suspicions of so many persons that his days and nights were passed in alarms, and he could hardly believe that any one was faithful to him. He was, indeed a brave and

[1] This name was given to an ancestor of Robert's on account of a particular kind of buckler worn by him, and was borne by the family generally as a surname without reference to individual character.

[2] See other contemporary notices of Robert de Belèsme's character. vol. ii. pp. 457, 458.

daring soldier, and was distinguished for his genius and eloquence as well as his courage, but he spoilt all by his excessive ambition and cruelty, and clouded the gifts which God had bestowed on him with the blackest crimes. His insolence and covetousness involved him in frequent wars with his neighbours, but he was often defeated and escaped with loss and disgrace. This is well known by the inhabitants of the Corbonnois and Maine, by his Norman neighbours, and nearest of all by the people of Exmes, who remained the victors when the tyrant fled. This was happily experienced by Geoffrey, earl of Morton, and his son Rotro, as well as by Elias of Maine, and other neighbouring lords, against whom he was always engaged in destructive hostilities, but at whose hands, by God's help, he suffered worse in return. He possessed thirty-four strongly fortified castles, and he had many thousand men under his dominion, yet Hugh de Nonant,[1] his neighbour, the poor master of a small castle, resisted him many years, and frequently caused him great losses and injuries.

Robert de Belèsme had married Agnes, daughter of Guy, count de Ponthieu, by whom he had William Talvas the heir of all his domains. The cruel husband did not respect his noble wife as he should have done on account of this precious child; on the contrary, he overwhelmed her with afflictions as if she had been a despicable mistress; and even confined her a long time like a thief, in the castle of Belèsme. At length she secretly effected her escape from her prison, by the aid and contrivance of a faithful chamberlain, and fled to Adela countess of Chartres,[2] and from thence sought refuge in Ponthieu, never to return to her tyrant.

Normandy was often afflicted by the cruel enterprises of this butcher, and Maine, with its immediate neighbourhood, was a prey to the pillage, fire, and slaughter, which accompanied his movements. The bishops and monks, on whose lands he erected castles, cried to the Lord of Sabaoth, when they saw the possessions of the saints diminished and wasted by his monstrous usurpations. At last the monks of St.

[1] Hugh, lord of Nonant-sur-Quenge, now a village and thoroughfare on the high road from Rouen to Alençon, and about nine English miles from the little city of Séez.

[2] Adela, countess of Blois, daughter of William the Conqueror.

Evroult, after suffering much loss, difficulty, and alarm, were no longer able to bear his hostility. They therefore, by compulsion, raised a tax[1] from the whole of their lands, which had till this time been free from all such unjust customary payments, and gave Robert sixty livres of Maine of the rents of the farms to save the convent and its tenants from further vexations, and to secure to the servants of God permission to devote themselves with pious joy to his sacred worship.[2] Other convents of monks, and unprotected clergy, redeemed themselves from his exactions in like manner, and conciliated the furious tyrant by payment of large sums of money, inasmuch as neither kings nor dukes were then able to restrain his violence by their princely authority, and so give quiet to the church.

CH. XXV. *Death of Roger de Montgomery, and some other of the Conqueror's old adherents—Their characters and descendants—Also the death and epitaphs of several abbots —The abbey of St. Stephen at Caen completed.*

AT that time the old nobility, who had borne arms under Duke Robert or his son King William, were following the way of all flesh and taking leave of the world. Roger de Montgomery devoutly assumed the habit of a monk at Shrewsbury, and passed three days in pious discourse and prayer among the servants of God in the abbey of St. Peter the Apostle, which he had founded outside the walls of the town between the two rivers, the Mole and the Severn.[3] At length he died on the sixth of the calends of August [the 27th of July], and was buried in the church of St. Peter.[4] On his death, his son, Hugh de Montgomery, succeeded to his

[1] *Dicam*, a tally, a notched stick, which we remember in our younger days being used by bakers in towns, and have seen still more recently resorted to by persons in remote districts, who could not write, for keeping accounts. They were formerly used in the Exchequer in England, and in France the word *taille* became for the same reason synonymous with tax.

[2] *Theusebia*, a Greek word signifying the worship of God, Latinized by our author.

[3] Ordericus has given a full account of the foundation of this abbey, in which his own father Odelirius assisted, and where he assumed the monastic habit, in chap. xiv. of his fifth book. See vol. ii. pp. 197—203.

[4] The date given in the chapter referred to in the preceding note is 1094. M. Le Prevost thinks it ought to have been 1095.

English earldom, and Robert de Belèsme possessed all his domains in Normandy. Roger of Poitou, Arnulph, Philip, and Everard, had no share in their father's inheritance, the two eldest brothers having, as I have said, divided the whole, as well on this side of the sea as the other. However, Roger and Arnulph, who ranked high among their countrymen as knights and men of worth, by their father's advice, married noble wives,[1] procured for them by him, and both were made earls, and for some time were distinguished for their power and wealth, but before their death, they forfeited for their treason the honours and estates they had acquired. Philip and Everard, who devoted themselves with ability to the pursuit of learning, met different fates in the course of their lives. Philip accompanied Duke Robert in his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and died at Antioch,[2] but Everard, who was the son of the countess Adelaide,[3] had some inferior employment as a clerk in the chapel of King Henry.

Roger de Beaumont, a wise and discreet nobleman, who was always true to his fealty to his lords the dukes of Normandy, also bent his head under the monastic yoke, when his military career was ended, in the abbey of St. Pierre-de-Preaux. That house was founded by his father, Humphrey de Vieilles, on his own domains,[4] and he had enriched it after his father's death with large possessions and many ornaments. There Robert de Beaumont, son of Humphrey, who was slain by Roger de Clare,[5] was buried,

[1] Roger of Poitou, so called because he married the countess of March; Arnulph married the daughter of a king of Ireland. See the note, vol. ii. p. 203, as to the titles and possessions of these young lords. The forfeiture was incurred by their having espoused the cause of Robert Curthose in 1102.

[2] We shall hear of this person again in the book following.

[3] She was the daughter of Everard, lord of Puiset, and the second wife of Roger de Montgomery.

[4] Now called Beaumont-le-Roger, on the left bank of the Risle. Beaumont, Vieilles, and other domains, appear to have been given to Humphrey de Vieilles by his brother Ralph, who managed the estates of the abbey of Bernai as steward before 1048, when he was chosen abbot of Mount St. Michael. The example of Ralph was followed by his successor Theodore, a monk of Jumièges, who made over one moiety of the town of Bernai and an immense country district, to Roger de Montgomery, being, as it is said, his relation.

[5] Roger de Clare, or de Bienfaite, is the same person as is mentioned in a note, p. 18, and brother of Gilbert de Tunbridge, or Clare, also

and Roger himself, his brother, who was advanced in years, made a good end in that monastery, some years after his profession as a monk. He left his sons, Robert and Henry, the appointed heirs of his domains, who by the grace of God have become very eminent in the present age. Distinguished by the friendship and intimacy of kings and powerful earls, they married noble and fruitful wives, and, surrounded by promising children of both sexes, they were loaded with riches and honours. Robert became earl of Mellent in the Vexin, as heir to Hugh, his mother Adeline's brother, and in England fortunately received from King Henry a grant of the earldom of Leicester with many other rich favours.[1] His brother Henry earned the earldom of Warwick by his valour and loyalty,[2] and obtained for wife the beautiful Margaret, daughter of Geoffrey, earl of Morton, whose character for piety and excellence is well known through all the neighbouring countries, and ranks her among the most eminent women. She bore her husband two sons, Roger, and Robert de Neubourg who became illustrious in England and Normandy during the reign of King Henry. These earls had naturally a great regard for the abbey of Préaux, which their ancestors had founded on an admirable situation near a sea-port,[3] and not far from Pont-Audemer, where the Risle flows in a rapid current towards the sea.[4] Monks were assembled there for the praise and worship of Almighty God, and piously instructed by wise and religious masters in regular discipline.[5]

there mentioned. He was still living in 1120, and bore indifferently the two names of Clare, his father's castle in Suffolk, and of Bienfaite, near Orbec. The church of St. John at Clare was given to the abbey of Bec in 1090 by his brother Gilbert. It is probable that Robert de Beaumont, or as he should rather have been called, de Vieilles, for Beaumont was his brother Roger's castle, was killed by Roger de Clare in some skirmish connected with the possession of Brionne.

[1] In 1103.

[2] In 1068.

[3] M. Le Prevost thinks Honfleur is meant; M. Dubois, Quillebœuf, at the mouth of the Seine.

[4] The Risle does not properly discharge its waters into the sea, but into the estuary of the Seine, on its left bank, between the two places mentioned in the preceding note.

[5] Our author has made such frequent digressions that he has forgotten

The following epitaph which may be seen on a tomb in the cloister near the south door of the church points out to those who read it who was the first abbot of Préaux, and how he was distinguished: "Under this tomb rests Abbot Ansfrid, a good and pious man, a dove without spot. He zealously fulfilled the demands of the divine law, which was his rule and study. He was the support of the weak, the adviser of the doubtful, feet to the lame, eyes to the blind, and the pilgrim's staff. The sun had blazed thirty days in the constellation of Pisces, when Abbot Ansfrid departed. God give him rest!"[1]

Richard de Fourneaux[2] governed this monastery in later times,[3] he was admitted to the profession of a monk in the abbey of St. Vigor at Bayeux by Robert de Tombelene. But bishop Odo, who founded the new monastery, becoming a sorrowful prisoner in the dungeon of King William, and Robert the Philosopher being returned to the abbey at Mount St. Michael of which he was a monk—or rather as I

to give any account of the military operations in Normandy in the year 1094, though some of them occurred in his own neighbourhood.

In the beginning of the year, Robert sent envoys to England to inform his brother that, chagrined by his refusal to execute the treaty they had agreed on, he should recommence hostilities. William went to Hastings on the 1st of February to attend the consecration of Battle Abbey, and crossed the channel in the middle of Lent. The barons who had sworn to the treaty offended William, who retired in dudgeon to Eu, while Robert returned to Rouen. The king, by largesses and promises, assembled a large body of troops, and renewed his understanding with some of the Norman lords. He then took by assault the castle of Bures, treating the garrison with great severity. In short, he left no stone unturned to drive his brother to extremity. Meanwhile Robert demanded aid from King Philip, who took the town of Argentan from William's partizans, and made a number of prisoners, while Robert reduced the strong castle of Homme in the Cotentin, where William Peverell commanded a garrison of eight hundred troops. This fortress did not belong to William, but to his brother Prince Henry, with whom he was then on terms of amity. The gold of the king of England, scattered freely, put an end to this prosperous career of his enemies, and induced the king of France to retire suddenly to his own dominions. It is very singular that the siege of Argentan should pass without notice by an historian who lived within ten leagues of it.

[1] Ansfrid, first abbot of Preaux, 1044?—March 17, 1078.

[2] Fourneaux, a lordship and hamlet near Faverolles and Portes, in the canton of Conches.

[3] 1101—January 30, 1131.

before related having migrated to Italy—the new and unfinished foundation was speedily dissolved, and the company of the faithful which had flocked there from different convents was soon dispersed for want of a ruler.[1] Richard, one of them, who was very learned in sacred literature, when the young flock was scattered, sought out a company of religious and learned men, in whose society he lived devoutly in the enjoyment of their useful teaching.

At that time there flourished in Normandy, Anselm, abbot of Bec, Gerbert of Fontenelles, Gontard of Jumièges,[2] and many others who were shining lights in the temple of God, by whom Richard was highly enlightened and enriched with the fulness of sound doctrine. On the death of Abbot Geoffrey,[3] Richard was elected to succeed him at Préaux and, having governed the convent nearly twenty-four years in the times of Duke Robert and King Henry, then died. He was deeply read in the holy scriptures, from his youth he walked in the way of the ancient fathers chanting psalms, he kindly broke the mystical bread in the house of the Lord to the hungry children, and distributed it with joy freely to those who stretched out their hands, and used authority to make those partake of it who refused or were careless. He dedicated a Commentary on Genesis to Maurice the learned abbot of St. Lomer at Blois, and wrote another for Master[4] Adelelm, a very learned priest, who was also a monk of St. Germer, and grew old devoutly serving the Holy Trinity with the monks of Fécamp. He wrote an excellent exposition on the Parables[5] of Solomon for Pontius, the illustrious abbot of Cluni, and lucidly commented on Ecclesiastes, the Canticles, and Deuteronomy, for other venerable persons, and composed several treatises on the allegories and types contained in obscure passages of the Prophets.[6]

[1] See vol. ii., p. 429.

[2] St. Anselm, abbot of Bec, 1078—December 4, 1093.
Gerbert, abbot of Fontenelles, 1063—September 4, 1089.
Gontard, abbot of Jumièges, 1078—November 20, 1095.

[3] Geoffrey, third abbot of Preaux, 1096—August 30, 1101.

[4] *Domno;* from whence the title of *Dom*, given to French ecclesiastics.

[5] Meaning the Proverbs.

[6] For the works of Richard de Fourneaux, consult *L'Histoire Littéraird de France*, t. ix. p. 107.

Nicholas, priest and abbot of the monastery dedicated to the holy bishop St. Ouen, was third son of Richard III., duke of Normandy, and distinguished for great benevolence, charity, and other virtues; his eminence in the church of God continuing till four years after the death of his cousin King William. Compelled by his uncle, Duke Robert, to embrace the monastic life, he made his profession when yet a boy in the abbey of Fécamp under Abbot John. Some years afterwards, while still young, he was advanced by Duke William to the government of the same abbey. Being raised to this eminence, he strove rather to be the benefactor than the superior of those who were under his rule both within and without the convent. Having undertaken a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and prayed at the sepulchre of our Lord, on his return, he died in the fifty-sixth year[1] of his government, on the fourth of the calends of March [27th of February] and being interred in the church of St. Peter the Apostle, which he founded himself, before the altar of St. Mary, mother of God,[2] there waits the better life of the resurrection. There is erected over his grave a beautiful tomb of painted wood, at the top of which Maurice the monk elegantly inscribed the following epitaph in letters of gold:—

"Nicholas, the flower and glory of monks, beloved and lamented, whose remains are here deposited, lives with the Lord. He governed his flock in love; and built this church. This star set when the sun was glowing in the constellation of Pisces."

Helgot, prior of Caen, eminent for his learning and good qualities succeeded the venerable Nicholas, and held the government of the abbey of St. Ouen nearly twenty years.[3] Under him the convent of that church was worthily augmented in numbers and piety. At that time a layman,

[1] Nicholas of Normandy, abbot of St. Ouen at Rouen, 1036, or 1042, to the 27th or 28th of February, 1092; it being a question whether he held it fifty-six years, as here stated, or fifty, as the continuator of William de Jumièges says.

[2] It is supposed that the semicircular portion of the building which now stands between the present church and the hotel of the mairie, is the north apsis of this building. St. Peter was originally the patron saint to whom the abbey was dedicated.

[3] Helgot, 1092—November 20, 1112.

named Gilbert, came from Jerusalem to Rouen, and being admitted a monk by Abbot Helgot rendered great services to the convent; for he undertook the charge of the works in the church, which on account of its vast scale of grandeur had been for some time suspended.[1] He made large donations to it from the fortune of Alberede la Grosse, in whose service he was, who having died on the holy pilgrimage bequeathed her wealth to him. With this and the aid of other pious and charitable gifts, he laboured towards the completion of the noble work. Abbot Helgot died on the twelfth of the calends of December [20th of November], and having been interred before the altar of St. Stephen the protomartyr which stands in the vestibule on the north side, William Balot,[2] who had been a monk of the same convent from his childhood, succeeded him in the government and held it for nearly fourteen years. In his time the great church, of which Abbot Nicholas had laid the foundation, was at length, after great difficulty, completed at the end of seventy years, and consecrated by Archbishop Geoffrey, with many others of the prelates and inferior clergy on the sixteenth of the calends of November [17th October].[3]

The same year Abbot William died, and Ragenfrid, a monk of the same house, succeeded him,[4] in whose time the cloisters and other buildings for the use of the monks were completed with great magnificence. At the same period Fulbert, archdeacon and dean of Rouen, fell sick, and

[1] It is very possible that part of the church now standing was the work of Gilbert. It is true that the abbey was destroyed by fire in 1136, but it can scarcely be supposed that it was entirely laid in ruins, and the existing portions of the church appear to present rather the character of the eleventh century than that of an advanced period of the twelfth. The north chapel, in the vestibule which led to the cloisters, alluded to a few lines further on, and which now bears the name of *Chambre aux Clercs*, may have been part of the building erected by Gilbert. This precious architectural relic is evidently the apsis, in two ranges, of a chapel at the end of the north transept. Its exterior appearance is very plain, and it is almost lost between the two immense structures which tower above it to the right and left, but within it has the chaste and simple character of the early Norman or Romanesque architecture.

[2] William Balot, 1112—1126.

[3] The new church was consecrated on the 17th of October of the year 1126, as is more clearly stated in our author's twelfth book.

[4] Raginfroi, 1126—1141 or 1142.

devoutly assumed the monastic habit. On his death he was interred in the cloisters of St. Ouen, at the entrance of the chapter-house, where his grave is covered with a white slab. The following inscription engraved on it shows who he was:—

"The glory of the metropolitan church, the crown and honour of the clergy departed when Fulbert died, and his eloquent tongue was silenced, from which flowed inexhaustible streams of profound wisdom. He was first a canon, then a monk, and afterwards archdeacon of Rouen. This great pillar of the church, who was second to no one in piety, was levelled with the ground on the fourth day before that of Christ's glorious nativity by the blessed Virgin."

CH. XXVI. *Controversy between the abbot and monks of Moléme regarding the rule of St. Benedict—Questions as to the habit, labour, and discipline—The Cistercian order founded with a stricter rule—The first abbots of the new order.*

THE happy decease of the fathers who depart in Christ fills their loving children on earth with sorrow; for notwithstanding the undoubting belief that they are exalted to the heavenly kingdom, their removal is affectionately lamented from apprehensions of the excessive desolation of those who are left exiles here below. But the divine mercy often visits the church, consoling it by the invisible influences of God's loving kindness, and sending it courageous champions, daily strengthens it for the conflict. Thus the prophet says, "Instead of thy fathers, thou shalt have children."[1] When the apostles were translated to heaven, they were succeeded by apostolical doctors, who were eminent for their acts and words in the courts of Jerusalem, and still offer to God the acceptable fruits of their labours. Iniquity abounding in the world, the devotions of the faithful in religion still more increased, and the harvest was multiplied in the field of the Lord. Monasteries were built everywhere in the woods and the fields, and tribes of cowled monks, with new rites and clad in vestments of various fashions, traverse the world. Their dress is generally white, to distinguish themselves

[1] Psalm xliv. 17.

from other men and make themselves remarkable. Black denotes humility in several places of the Holy Scriptures; and therefore the religious in their zeal have hitherto joyfully adopted that colour. But now black, which the old fathers used as a token of their humility, the regular clergy in their copes, and the monks in their cowls, is rejected by the moderns, in ostentation of greater righteousness, and they try to distinguish themselves from others by the peculiar cut of their garments.[1] I believe that voluntary poverty, contempt of the world, and true religion inspire the greater part of them, but many hypocrites and seducing pretenders are mingled with them, as tares among the wheat. Paganus, a canon of Chartres, surnamed Bolotinus, has lately published a fine poem in Adonic verse,[2] in which he has cleverly and fully exhibited their superstitions veiled with hypocrisy. I propose myself to unfold in the present history how and by whom the changes in the ancient fashion began lately to spread, because I think that these details may be acceptable to my readers in future times.

There is a place in Burgundy, called Molême,[3] of which Reynold, bishop of Langres[4] said: "The love of Molême almost conferred the grace of baptism."[5]

In the time of Philip, king of France, the venerable abbot Robert built a monastery there,[6] and inspired by the grace of the Holy Spirit, assembled disciples of devoted piety, and instructed them with kindness in the pursuit of virtue in a state of holy poverty, according to the usage of other religious houses. After some years he studied carefully the rule of St. Benedict, and having also examined the writings of other holy fathers, he assembled the brethren, and thus addressed them, "My dear brethren, we have made our profession according to the rule of St. Benedict, but it appears to me that we do not observe it in its integrity. We follow many practices which are not found there, and

[1] Ordericus himself, as a Benedictine monk, wore the black habit of that order.

[2] This poem is lost. Query, read *Belotinus*, or *Balotenus*?

[3] Molême, near Châtillon.

[4] Reynold, of the family of the counts of Bar-sur-Seine and Tonnerre, bishop of Langres, end of 1065—beginning of April, 1085.

[5] *Est quasi baptismus, quibus est in amore Molismus.*

[6] In 1075.

we negligently omit many which it has enjoined. We do not labour with our hands as we read that the holy fathers did. If you do not believe what I say, my friends, read the acts of St. Anthony, Macarius, Pacomius, and, above all, of the doctor of the Gentiles, Paul the apostle. We are supplied with an abundant maintenance in food and clothing from the tithes and oblations of the churches, and, either by address or violence, we appropriate what belongs to the priests. I therefore should wish that we keep the entire rule of St. Benedict, being careful to deviate from it neither to the right hand or the left. Let us procure what is necessary for food and raiment by the labour of our hands. Let us give up the use of coverings for the thighs, and linen and furs, and relinquish tithes and oblations to the clergy who serve the parishes. Thus, treading in the steps of the fathers, we shall labour with zeal to follow Christ."

The convent of monks did not agree to these proposals; they objected to innovations which would alter their usages, the examples and precepts of their predecessors, whose lives were rendered illustrious by evident miracles, and who trod in the footsteps of venerable men. They said: "We have long followed the way of life, in which the holy fathers formerly lived religiously in France, whose sanctity was testified to be well pleasing to God, by miracles both during their lives and after their interment. As to your rebuke, venerable father, because we have departed from the rigour of the monastic rule, and do not walk in the rough path of the Egyptian monks who dwelt in the Thebaid and the Holy Land, among barbarous nations in ancient times, reflect carefully on the sufficient reason.

"No doctor can justly require the faithful to endure in times of tranquillity, all the sufferings which the holy martyrs were compelled to undergo in the heathen persecutions, since they themselves did not voluntarily submit before those persecutions to the same suffering which afterwards they necessarily endured when contending for their faith. This was plainly intimated by our Lord to St. Peter, 'When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee,

and carry thee whither thou wouldest not."[1] Consider well, according to the precepts of the divine law with what discretion you ought to direct those in the way of God, who have voluntarily quitted the depraved world, and desire to lead a better life under your government. With what reason can it be approved that those who of their own free will are seeking to change their evil courses for good, should be driven to the dens of Paul or Anthony. To escape from being put to death, and in terror even of their own relations, these hermits fled from their parental homes. A prudent physician gives his patient soothing prescriptions, for fear that if he should torment him in his weakness with severe medicines, instead of being cured, he should escape altogether out of his hands. No considerate persons will lay an insupportable burden on weak shoulders, lest the weary bearer, sinking under his load, perish in the way."

The monks making this open resistance, Abbot Robert said to them; "I mention the inimitable life of the Egyptian hermits as an example of excellence, but I do not thence impose on you any violent exactions; I only propose it in the way of salutary persuasion. But I invite you to observe the rule of St. Benedict in all its parts, which I know you to transgress in many things, notwithstanding you profess it. I therefore dread lest the wrath of the supreme Judge should be let loose upon us in the last judgment for our short comings."

To this, the monks replied, "Our blessed father Benedict, as is known to all, sent into France St. Maur, the prior of his monastery, whom he had educated from childhood, and gave him the book of discipline which the servant of God had written with his own hand, and he granted to the French monks through him a pound of bread and half a pint of wine. St. Maur meeting with a kind reception from King Theodebert, spent the rest of his life in France, and, by the aid of Florus, a counsellor of the king's, built a monastery at a place called Glanfeuil,[2] where he instructed one hundred and forty monks in the rules of his order. The discreet

[1] John xxi. 18.

[2] St. Maur arrived at Glanfeuil in 543. It is not clear how Anjou could have belonged to Theodebert, king of Austrasia, but the fact seems certain from the testimony of a contemporary biographer.

father St. Maur did not imitate the usages of the monks in Egypt, who are exposed to the excessive heat of the climate, but kindly took into consideration the habits of the French, inhabitants of the west, who often shudder in the frosts of winter. And so he was instructed by his spiritual master; for thus saith St. Benedict:—'Let the garments given to the monks be suitable to the nature of the place they inhabit, and the temperature of the air. Those who live in cold climates require more, those in warm climates less. This is left to the abbot's discretion.' So also he makes prudent and considerate regulations respecting food and drink, and other human wants, that all may be done according to measure, with due regard to the weak, and without murmurings. He also expressly admonishes the abbot to make allowance for infirmities; he ordains that such work or employment should be enjoined on the weak and delicate, that they shall neither be idle, nor worn and overdone by excessive labour. Paul and Anthony, and many others, who first retired into the desert, and built themselves monasteries in the recesses of the wilderness, driven to it by fear of the heathen, as we said before, chose an extremely rigorous course of life, and, assisted by God's grace, converted the necessity into an act of free will. Afterwards their laudable example increased the number of those who renounced the world, and founded various institutions according to the difference in places and men's habits. But, says St. Gregory, where the faith is one, diversity of customs in the holy church matters not. Men in general, where the climate is warm, wear no trowsers, but, like women, wear loose robes which reach to the ankles. The convents of monks which rose and became established in those countries do not reject this habit, but on the contrary adopt it. But in the climate of the west, all men wear trowsers, and they cannot be dispensed with, neither on account of the cold nor for decency's sake. For these reasons that is the custom in our order, nor can we consent, as it is becoming and serviceable, to depart from it. So of all the rest, learned doctors, our predecessors in this holy discipline, have supplied us with good reasons for their observance. In Italy and Palestine, and some other countries, olive trees abound, and men making use of the fruit are not obliged to have recourse to fat in cooking their

food, which is here considerately allowed to us, who have no oil of olives.

"Further, it is made a subject of severe rebuke by many persons that we are not daily employed in working with our hands; but we boldly set against this our devoted labour in the offices of divine worship, which we were taught on our profession by duly authorized masters, experienced in the daily services of our holy religion. The kings, Dagobert and Theodoric, and the emperor Charlemagne, and other kings and emperors, in their devotion, founded monasteries, and made ample provision from their revenues for the food and raiment of the servants of God; attaching to these institutions a sufficient number of servants for the full performance of exterior offices, while they assigned to the monks the duty of being entirely devoted to reading, to prayers for their benefactors and the celebration of the divine mysteries. In consequence, the practice is in France, both from the foundations of the kings and long custom, that the peasants should carry on the works of husbandry, as it is their business to do, and servants perform all ministerial offices, while the monks, who have voluntarily withdrawn from the vanities of the world, should serve as militants the King of kings, shut themselves up in their cloisters, free from intrusion, like king's daughters, penetrate the mysteries of the divine word by diligently reading it, and making it the subject of their constant meditations, observe a profitable silence, closing their mouths against a depraved and idle conversation but chanting day and night the Psalms of David and other mystical songs to the Creator's praise; and be daily engaged, according to the precepts of the fathers, in other decent and fitting employments, as circumstances require. Hitherto such are the labours of the monks in the west, and every one sees and knows that such ought to be the nature of their occupations. God forbid that the peasants, whose proper lot is daily toil, should abandon themselves to sloth, and with lascivious indolence spend their time in laughter and idle merriment; on the other hand, far be it from illustrious knights, acute philosophers, and accomplished scholars, because they have renounced the world, to be bound to occupy themselves in servile and unbeseeming pursuits and occupations, like vile slaves. The tithes and oblations of the

faithful are by common consent appropriated to the clergy and ministers of God for their own sustenance, as St. Paul, the apostle said to the Corinthians: 'They which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar.'[1] So the Lord has ordained that those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. As for us, we belong to the clergy by our order and office, and we offer service, as ministers, to the great High-priest, who has entered into the heavens, that we may obtain the lot of our heavenly inheritance, through his mediation. We therefore have a right to hold ecclesiastical benefices, and by common agreement, we are determined to retain them. It is perfectly well known to your holiness, reverend father, that we have learnt to preserve these rules from former monks who lived religiously, and we possess them as heirs to their order and profession. As long as we find the monks of Cluni and Tours, and the other clergy maintaining these institutions we shall not depart from them; for we are unwilling to be condemned by our brethen, far and wide, as reckless innovators and inventors of novel practices."

The monks constantly repeating these declarations and others of the same description, the abbot, persisting in his opinion, withdrew from them with twelve[2] of the number who agreed with him, and was a long time before he could find a suitable place for himself and his companions where they might observe the rule of St. Benedict to the letter, as the Jews kept the law of Moses. At last, Eudes, duke of Burgundy, son of Henry, took pity on them, and gave them an estate called Cisterce in the diocese of Châlons.[3] Abbot Robert and his select brethren, dwelt for some time in this desert, and beginning to build a monastery in which they might live a religious life under the strictest rule, found, by God's grace, in a short time. many who became emulous of

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 13.

[2] Robert withdrew from Molême with only six monks, whose names are preserved, to consult the archbishop of Lyons, the papal legate; but having returned to his monastery, he left it again, accompanied on this occasion by twenty monks, having received and published the letter which gave him authority to retire and found a new establishment.

[3] Citeaux, near Nuits, in the diocese of Châlons.

such sanctity.[1] As the monks of Molême were left for some time without a pastor, and by the secession of the man of God they were less esteemed by their neighbours and acquaintance, they applied humbly to Pope Urban, and laying before him the whole course of affairs implored his advice and aid. The pope, with paternal kindness, took the case of both parties into consideration. In virtue of his apostolical authority he enjoined Abbot Robert to return to his first convent and to govern it according to its rule, to prevent its dissolution, appointing a substitute in the new monastery he had begun, selected from those he thought qualified. He further decreed that every monk should at the commencement of his profession, choose the institutions under which he proposed to live, and should adhere to them without change ever afterwards.

That able pope issued on this occasion a decree to the following effect: "The utmost care must be taken lest a horrible schism be nourished in the house of God and it should grow and be spread abroad to the general injury; and on the other hand, that the grace which is given from on high for the salvation of souls be not impiously extinguished. We therefore provide from our fatherly affection, and ordain by our apostolical authority, that the monks of Molème who prefer the general rules of the monastic order shall inviolably observe them, and not presume to desert their own convent and adopt other customs. As for the Cistericans who make a boast of keeping the rule of St. Benedict in all particulars, let them not by another change return to a system which they now hold in contempt. Steadfastness in a convent, and perseverance in every good way are most laudable and to be firmly maintained, because they are acceptable to the Creator who requires in sacrifice even the rump of the victim,[2] and is agreeable to men who are roused to excellence by having before their eyes models of holiness."

Thus compelled, Abbot Robert returned to Molème[3] and there served God worthily to the end of his days.[4] He

[1] The infant society was organized, and the new statutes adopted, on Palm Sunday, March 21, 1098, the feast of St. Benedict.

[2] Lev. iii. 9.

[3] In 1099.

[4] He died at a very advanced age in 1110, probably on the 17th of April, that being the day of his feast.

chose as his vicar for the affairs of Cîteaux, Alberic, a man of deep piety, and appointed him abbot, to govern John and Ildebode,[1] both of Arras, and the rest of the twenty-two Cistercian brothers. He dwelt there ten years in great penury, and, with his fraternity, laboured painfully in the service of God, from whom he confidently expected an inestimable recompence. On his death he was succeeded by Stephen, an Englishman of great religion and learning, who for more than twenty-four years was eminent for his doctrine and good deeds.[2] In his time the monastery in the wilderness received a great increase. Guy, abbot of Trois-Fontaines[3] was chosen abbot of Cîteaux, while Stephen was still living, and by his desire; and not long afterwards the venerable Stephen departed this life. Guy, having accepted the office, performed it with little credit for two years, at the end of which he as foolishly resigned it.[4] Thereupon the young Reynold, son of Milo, count of Bar-sur-Seine, was elected abbot, and consecrated by Walter, bishop of Chalons.

It is now thirty-seven years since Abbot Robert settled at Cîteaux,[5] and in this short time so great a concourse of monks has been drawn thither, that sixty-five monasteries have been founded, all subject with their abbots to the superior abbot of Citeaux. All the monks of the Cistercian order wear neither trowsers nor robes of fur; they abstain from fat and flesh-meat, and by their worth shine like lights

[1] John was one of the six monks who quitted Molême in 1098 with Abbot Robert.

Ildebode was one of the fourteen who joined them after their return to that abbey.

[2] Alberic died in 1109, and was immediately replaced by Stephen Harding, an Englishman, who had been a monk at Sherbourne. He resigned his office in 1133, and died the 28th of March, 1134.

[3] Guy, abbot of Trois Fontaines (Haute Marne) in 1127, was not the person elected, as our author supposes, but a monk bearing the same Christian name.

[4] The monk Guy, who was elected in 1133, during the life of his venerable predecessor, was deposed and expelled with disgrace for an abominable crime, with the mention of which the annalists of the Cistercian order did not choose to pollute their pages. This expulsion took place not at the end of two years, but of the first month. Guy was replaced by Rainard, a monk of Clairvaux, the particular friend of St. Bernard.

[5] This paragraph was therefore written in the year 1135.

in a dark place. They maintain perpetual silence, use no garments which have been dyed, and labouring with their own hands provide their food and raiment. From the ides [13th] of September to Easter they fast every day except Sunday; their doors are always shut close, and they bury themselves in profound secrecy, admitting no monks belonging to any other religious house into their cells, nor allowing them to be present in the chapel at mass or other divine offices. Multitudes of noble champions and learned men joined their society from the novelty of its institutions, and voluntarily submitting to their canonical rigour, rejoiced to chant triumphant anthems to Christ in the right way. Monasteries were erected in the wastes and woods by their own labour, and the names given, were, by a wise provision, of a sacred character, such as Maison-Dieu, Clairvaux, Bonmont and L'Aumône,[1] and others of the same sort; the very sound of which invited the hearers to hasten to places whose names bespoke the blessedness to be found in them.

Thirsty souls, without number, flocked to drink at the fountain-head, from whence numerous streams were diverted into all parts of France; and zealous followers of the new rule were dispersed through Aquitaine, Britain, Gascony, and Ireland. Pretenders to piety, however, have become mixed with the genuine members of the society, and, clothed in white robes or other varieties of dress, impose upon mankind, and present an attractive exhibition to the people. For the most part they imitate the true worshippers of God rather in their exterior forms than their virtues; their very numbers disgust those who remark them, and, in the mistaken views of human ignorance, bring their worthier brethren into contempt.

[1] *Maison Dieu*, afterwards called Noirlac, near La Celle Bruyère in the department of the Cher; *Domus Dei supra Carum, postea Niger Lacus*, an abbey of the Cistercian order, founded about the year 1136. Robert, nephew of St. Bernard, was the first abbot.

Clairvaux, founded in 1115 by St. Bernard, at a place called the valley of Absinthe.

Bon Mont, affiliated to Clairvaux, situated in the diocese of Geneva, and founded the 7th of June, 1131.

L'Aumône, or Le Petit-Citeaux, four leagues S.S.E. of Châteaudun, founded by Theobald IV., count de Blois.

CH. XXVII. *Account of several monasteries founded in France—And of eminent abbots and other ecclesiastics.*

AT the same time flourished Andrew, a venerable monk of Vallambrosa,[1] who built the abbey of Chezal-Benedict, in the territory of Bourges, teaching his disciples to serve God in great poverty and continence of life. He was a native of Italy, of profound learning, and well fitted to gain souls for Christ, through his grace.

Aldebert, abbot of Dol, was now promoted to the archbishopric of Bourges,[2] a prelate endowed with great virtues, who by word and deed bore testimony of holiness to those who desired to become followers of Christ. Garnier de Montmorillon, this archbishop's brother,[3] was a gallant knight, who afterwards enlisted in the service of God, and was nearly sixty years a monk of Maison-Dieu.[4] While he was yet in the world, in his military career, he was on one occasion returning from a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. James, when, on entering a wood in company with his squire only, he suddenly encountered a sick mendicant who asked for alms. The knight not having any money ready at hand, piously gave him his rich gauntlets, which were a present from his mistress. Some time afterwards, as a devout servant of God was praying in his oratory after matins, an angel appeared to him in a vision, and gave him special directions for a mission he was to undertake. The monk making particular inquiry by whose authority the command

[1] *Valle Bruciorum;* softened by the Italians into Val-ombrosa, a name very significant of its delightful situation among the forests which clothe the base of the Appennines.

> Thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks
> In Vallombrosa, where the Etrurian shades
> High over-arched embower.
>
> *Par. Lost*, b. i. 303.

Andrew, a monk of Vallombrosa, founded the abbey of Chezal-Benedict, three leagues from Stoudun, in 1093.

[2] Audebert, archbishop of Bourges, 1092 or 1093—1096.

[3] Garnier de Montmorillon, in the department of Vienne. These two noble persons were cousins of Judith, daughter of Robert II., count d'Auvergne, who married Simon, count de Crépi and Valois, and was conducted by them, a short time after her marriage, to the abbey of Val-Dieu, where she took the veil. See before, vol. ii. p. 407.

[4] According to the biography of Bernard, abbot of Tiron this nobleman made his profession at St. Cyprian's in Poitiers.

was given him: "He it is," replied the angel, "who has sent me to you with this commission whom Martin clothed with part of his mantle, and to whom Garnier gave his gloves." The brother related this to his abbot, and it was plain to the older monks that the message had reference to the story of St. Martin, who, when only a catechumen at Amiens, rent his cloak and gave part of it to a poor man for Christ's sake; but as to Garnier's gauntlets, no account of the circumstance had as yet got abroad. At last he told with great simplicity to some persons who asked him about it, how he had done the good deed to a poor man for the love of Christ; and, upon learning from them the revelation which had been made, gave thanks to God, who is never wanting to those who act aright.

About this time Bernard, abbot of Quincé,[1] retired from Poitiers, because he had refused to subject his monastery, which had been independent to that time, to the abbey of Cluni. Being, as the scripture says of the just man, "bold as a lion,"[2] Bernard pleaded the cause of his independence against Pope Paschal before a council at Rome, and because the pope did not grant him perfect redress, appealed to the judgment of God. The pope reverenced his determined conduct, and begged him to remain at Rome to assist in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The abbot however chose to withdraw from all worldly cares,[3] and travelled through many countries in company with some monks whose zeal led them to follow him.[4] At last, after much journeying, he visited the venerable bishop Ives, who graciously received him, and settled him and his monks on the territory of the church of Chartres, where he built a monastery dedicated to St. Saviour in a woody district

[1] Bernard, a native of Ponthieu, was abbot of St. Cyprian at Poitiers in 1100.

[2] Proverbs xxviii. 1.

[3] The pope having at last done him justice, he returned to his abbey of St. Cyprian.

[4] Our author might have mentioned among the places visited by Bernard, the island of Chaufei, near Granville, where he had resided before he was raised to the dignity of abbot; then the neighbourhood of Fougères; then Arcisses, near Nogent-le-Rotrou; then, finally, he settled at Tiron, in the commune of Gardais, first temporarily in 1107, and at last permanently in 1110.

called Tiron. A multitude of the faithful of both orders flocked to him, and father Bernard received in his loving embraces all who were ready to make their profession, enjoining them to practise in his new monastery the occupations which each of them had learnt. In consequence there readily assembled about him workmen, both smiths and carpenters, sculptors and goldsmiths, painters and masons, vine-dressers and ploughmen, with skilled artificers in various branches of labour. They diligently employed themselves in the tasks assigned them by the abbot, and turned their gains to the common advantage. Thus where lately robbers sheltered themselves in a frightful forest, and cut the throats of unwary travellers, on whom they rushed unawares, a stately abbey was, by God's help, quickly reared. Theobald, count palatine, and his mother, Adèle, Rotro, count de Mortain, and his mother, Beatrix,[1] with many natives of Chartres, Dreux, and the Corbonnois, both gentle and simple, as well as the Christian people of the neighbourhood, finding the simplicity and worth of the good monks, paid them great respect, in the fear of the Lord, and rendered them effectual aid, both by their encouragement and their contributions, in adding strength to the citadel which they had begun to build in the cause of God.

The venerable Vitalis,[2] who was formerly chaplain of Robert, count de Mortain,[3] and a canon of the church of St. Evroult at Mortain,[4] divested himself of the burden of worldly cares and riches, and resolving to bear Christ's easy yoke in the footsteps of the apostles, retired for some time into a desert with some devout recluses. In this solitude he got rid of his former habits of indulgence, and learnt to submit to strict discipline. At last he remarked the village of Savigni,[5] where he found vast ruins of some ancient buildings, and began to erect[6] a monastery to the honour of

[1] Theobald IV., count de Blois; Adèle of Normandy, his mother; Rotrou, count du Perche; Beatrix de Rouci, his mother.

[2] Vitalis, a native of Tierceville, near Bayeux.

[3] Robert, count de Mortain, half brother of William the Conqueror.

[4] A collegiate church founded in 1082 by Robert, count de Mortain, and Matilda de Montgomery, his wife.

[5] Savigni-le-vieux, near Mortain.

[6] In 1105.

the holy and undivided Trinity in a neighbouring wood, choosing it for the abode of himself and his disciples. He determined not to adopt the customs of the monks of Cluni, or others who had been long subject to the monastic rule, but embraced the institutions of the new societies, so far as he approved of them. Vitalis was deeply imbued with erudite learning; his courage and eloquence were remarkable; and he was firm in carrying into effect whatever he proposed. Sparing neither high nor low in his public discourses, he raised his voice like the trumpet spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, showing the people of the Lord their transgressions and the house of Jacob their sins.[1] Kings and dukes showed him honour, and multitudes hastened at the dawn of day to listen to his words, and hearing from his mouth the sins they had secretly committed, retired in sorrow and confusion from his presence. Every rank in society was pricked to the heart by his just reproofs; all the world trembled before his rebukes; and crowds of both sexes were filled with shame at the misdoings he revealed. He laid bare the inmost recesses of vice, and awakened the conscience by his strictures to a sense of the most secret faults. It was thus that he subdued the pride of the great, and softened the obduracy of the vulgar crowd, while he made ladies of rank who were vain of their delicate robes of silk and the fine wool of Canusa,[2] to tremble before the sword of God's word which threatened their vices, smote their consciences stained with sin, and struck them with alarm by the awful thunder of the divine justice. Multitudes profited by the admonitions of the accomplished preacher, and many were led to become his disciples in the monastery he built, and in which he waged the fight of faith for seven years,[3] making a good end of an excellent life. After lying sick for a short time, he was carried into his oratory, where he made faithful confession, and received the viaticum of the holy communion, at the matins of the Virgin Mary: when the reader affectionately asked for his blessing, he gave it,

[1] Isa. lviii. 1.

[2] The flocks of the neighbourhood of Canusa, in Apulia, were anciently celebrated for the fine wool of their fleeces, from which fabrics of the most delicate texture were woven.

[3] The reading should probably be seventeen.

and as all present were repeating the *Amen*, his spirit fled.[1] On his death, he was succeeded by Geoffrey of Bayeux, a monk of Cerisi, who made very unreasonable innovations, and imposed a heavy yoke on the necks of his disciples.[2]

I have recorded for the benefit of posterity, these accounts of the modern institutions, the founders of which prefer their new inventions to the traditions of their predecessors, calling other monks secular, and presuming to condemn them as transgressors of the ancient rules. When I reflect on the zeal and strictness of their lives, I cannot severely condemn them, nor do I esteem them above our old and tried fathers. They are ignorant, I think, that St. Columban a native of Ireland, was a contemporary of St. Benedict,[3] and quitting his home and country, crossed over to France with some eminent monks, and being hospitably received by Childebert, king of the Franks, son of Sigebert, built the monastery of Luxeuil in Burgundy.[4] Being afterwards expelled by Queen Brunichild, he retired into Italy, and being received by Aigilulph, king of the Lombards, founded the abbey of Bobbio.[5] The labours of this holy father were most eminent; and gloriously crowned with miracles in the sight of the people, and inspired by the Spirit of God, he published a monastic rule, and was the first to introduce it into France. Many monks of great celebrity issued from that school, and shed light on the world by their virtues, like stars in the firmament. Eustace of Luxeuil, Agilus of Rebais, Faro of Meaux, Omer of Boulogne,[6] and Philibert of Jumièges,[7] with several other bishops and abbots of

[1] The 16th of September, 1122.

[2] Geoffrey, second abbot of Savigni, 1122—1138, or July 15, 1139.

[3] St. Columban, who died in 615, cannot be considered a contemporary of St. Benedict, who died in 543.

[4] Luxeuil, in Franche-Comté (590). St. Columban was expelled from this monastery in 610.

[5] The monastery of Bobbio, an episcopal city of Lombardy on the Trebia (613).

[6] St. Eustace, abbot of Luxeuil, 610—March 29, 625.
St. Agile, abbot of Rebais in Brie, 636—August 30, 650.
St. Faro, bishop of Meaux, 626—October 28, 672.
St. Omer, bishop of Térouanne in Artois, founder of the abbey of St. Bertin at St. Omer, about 660, died the 9th of September, 667. Our author gives him the title of bishop of Boulogne, because that city formed part of the diocese of Térouanne, and the bishops often made it their residence, and took their name from it.

[7] St. Filibert, or as it is commonly written, St. Philibert, the founder of

distinguished piety were of this number; whose sanctity was divinely authenticated by evident miracles, and by whose zeal the church was gloriously enlarged. These men, I think, must have been acquainted with St. Martin, his companions and disciples, inasmuch as they were neighbours and received from them the rule of St. Benedict, as well as the precepts of other doctors, written for edification; so far, however as they were not contrary to the statutes of their own master the excellent Columban. From him, indeed, they learned the forms and order of divine service, and the prayer for all conditions of men in the church of God, and assumed the black dress and other distinctions which they used for the sake of religion and decency, and which their successors to the present day desire to regard with respect.

What was the character of this great doctor, St. Columban, in the sight of God and man, the book containing his life, full of signs and miracles, sufficiently exhibits. Frequent mention is made in his acts of St. Ouen, archbishop of Rouen, of Eloi, bishop of Noyon, and of other persons who gathered around him, and by his instructions obtained the tranquillity which virtue gives.

Although recently occupied in writing the history of the abbey of St. Evroult, I have now taken a survey, as if I had been wrapt in a vision, of the vast kingdoms of the earth, so that, wandering far and wide in my discourse, and embracing many subjects, I have made an extensive digression. Wearied by this long excursion, I now return to my home at St. Evroult, and shall close the present book by relating briefly somewhat of our own affairs.

CH. XXVIII. *Death of Hugh de Grantmesnil, the founder of St. Evroult—Buried there, with his countess—His epitaph—Three of his sons join the crusade—His granddaughter marries the Earl of Leicester, who succeeds to what was left of the great estates of the family.*

IN the year of our Lord, 1098, the first indiction, Hugh de Grantmesnil, the illustrious lord, took to his bed in England,

the abbey of Jumièges in 655, died the 20th of August, about the year 684. His residence at Luxeuil and Bobbio was merely temporary. He received the monastic habit, not from St. Columban, but from St. Agile at Rebais.

worn out with age and infirmity, and his end approaching. He then received the monastic robe from Geoffrey of Orleans, prior of St. Evroult, who had been lately sent by Abbot Roger to England, to give him succour; and he died six days afterwards, that is, on the calends of March [the 22nd February].[1] His body, preserved in salt, and well sewn up in an ox-hide, was conveyed to Normandy by Bernard and David, monks of St. Evroult, and honourably interred by the abbot and convent, on the south side of the chapter house, near the tomb of Abbot Mainier. Arnold of Rhuddlan,[2] his nephew, caused a marble slab to be laid over his grave, and Vitalis[3] furnished the following epitaph in heroic verses:—

> With years and glory compassed, HUGH the brave
> Beneath this marble finds an honoured grave;
> Granton's ancestral towers supply a name
> Blazoned with lustre on the rolls of fame.
> Foremost among the Conqueror's valiant peers,
> Fair England's shore he sought in early years;
> And high above the tide of battle rose,
> Shield of his friends, and terror of his foes.
> Here he, with gifts and lands, and service due,
> Decked and enriched the shrine of St. Evroult.
> In monkish cowl, with penitence and prayer,
> When holy church kept feast of Peter's chair,
> The good old knight prepared himself to die;
> God give him peace among the blest on high!

Adeliza, wife of Hugh de Grantmesnil, had died at Rouen seven years before, on the fifth of the ides [11th] of July,[4]

[1] Probably at Leicester, in 1093, not 1098, which seems to be an error of the copyist.

[2] This person should have been called Arnold de Tilleul, or Arnold, son of Umfrid (Humphrey), instead of giving him the territorial qualification of his brother Robert, who was long since dead, and with which Arnold had nothing to do.

[3] The author; it has been remarked in the preface that he never uses his baptismal name of Ordericus, it being superseded by that of Vitalis, which he adopted on his profession as a monk. The modern union of the two names is therefore incorrect.

[4] *Ante septem annos obierat;* so that the date of Adeliza's death may have been either 1085 or 1089, according to the version given to the text. *Obierat* seems to indicate that she died before her husband, and the position of her grave in the place of honour, the right side, leads one to suppose she died first. On the other hand, Abbot Mainier lived till 1089,

and was interred in the chapter house at St. Evroult on the right of Abbot Mainier. This lady was daughter of Ivo, Count de Beaumont, by Judith, her mother. She bore her husband six sons and as many daughters, whose fates were subject to the fleeting changes of human affairs.

Robert, the eldest, was thrice married[1] before he advanced in years, but the ample patrimony he inherited from his father slipped through his hands. At last he died on the calends of June,[2] thirty eight years after his father, and was buried with his two wives, Agnes and Emma, in the chapter house at St. Evroult. His brother William stood high at the court of King William, by whom he was so much beloved that he offered him his niece, daughter of Robert, earl of Morton,[3] that he might attach the young man to him by the honour of so near an alliance. But the proud youth rejected the royal offer, and from love of change went to Apulia, with Robert Giffard, and several others, and marrying Mabel, surnamed Courte Louve, daughter of Robert Guiscard,[4] received fifteen castles as her dowry. He died there after his return from Antioch, leaving two sons, William and Robert, heirs of his estates.[5]

Hugh, a brave and excellent knight, died young, and was interred with honour in the chapter house at St. Evroult.[6]

Ivo held for some time his father's domains in England, but afterwards in the time of King Henry, he pledged them

and yet she is said to have been interred by his side. The author may, however, have spoken of the state of things existing at the time he wrote; and Adeliza's death in 1085 is rather confirmed by the circumstance of the manor of Brockbourne in Hertfordshire, which she held directly from King William, having been given to the monks of Bermondsey by her son Ivo before his departure in the crusade and consequently anterior to the year 1099.

[1] See before, vol. ii. book viii. c. 16, p. 505

[2] June 1, 1136.

[3] Robert, earl of Morton (or count de Mortain), had three daughters; it is supposed that the one here referred to was the eldest, who married Andrew, lord of Vitré, in Brittany, and son of Robert de Vitré, who was at the battle of Hastings.

[4] See vol. ii, p. 506.

[5] We shall hear more of this William de Grantmesnil in the succeeding book.

[6] See vol. ii. p. 426.

to Robert earl of Mellent, and went twice in pilgrimage to Jerusalem. In the first crusade he suffered much, as well as his companions, at Antioch; and in the second he died.[1]

Alberic, the youngest son, had his youth devoted to the study of letters, but when he grew up, he renounced the profession of a learned clerk, and embraced the career of arms, in which he endeavoured to distinguish himself by actions of signal bravery.[2] He wounded Tancred, son of the Good Marquis, a hero illustrious for his great achievements; who was lame, in consequence, the rest of his life.[3]

All these sons of Hugh de Grantmesnil, were in person tall and handsome, as well as of great courage; but fortune persecuted them, and neither of them, except Robert, enjoyed a long life, nor a continuance of peace and prosperity.

[1] The disgraceful manner in which he withdrew from the dangers and privations of the first Crusade is described in book ix.; and it is surprising that with his painful experience, he should have embarked a second time in such an enterprise. He left two sons, Ivo and Hugh. Petronilla, Hugh's daughter, and great grand-daughter of the founder of the abbey of St. Evroult, married the earl of Leicester, who in her right had all that remained of the inheritance of this family in Normandy and England. Robert, earl of Leicester, son of the Countess Petronilla, made a charter in favour of the abbey, which is still extant, though it has never been printed.

[2] Whatever our author may say, Alberic, or Aubrey, did not establish a more honourable character in the crusades than his brothers.

[3] This circumstance is not related by any other historian, and M. Le Prevost remarks that its authenticity may be suspected, particularly as Ralph of Caen, Tancred's biographer, omits to mention it as an additional complaint against the three Grantmesnils, whose cowardice at Antioch he severely stigmatises. But may not the biographer have been unwilling to admit that his hero was seriously wounded by one of these cowards?

BOOK IX.

CH. I. *Introduction to the ninth book—Its subject, the history of the first crusade—Former narratives.*

THE Eternal Creator wisely orders the revolutions of time and of human affairs, not disposing and altering them at the pleasure of senseless mortals, but his providence preserves, and his strong hand, and stretched-out arm, fitly carries forward and dispenses all. This is plainly seen in the changes of winter and summer, and not less felt in cold and heat; we perceive this in the origin and decay of all things, and the infinite variety of the works of God. Hence arise the numerous narratives of events which are daily occurring in the world, and materials are abundantly offered for eloquent historians to dwell upon. I reflect profoundly on these things, and commit the result of my meditations to writing; because in our days we have an unexpected revolution, and a noble theme for marvellous tales is offered to the pen of the writer.

Lo! the crusade to Jerusalem is entered on by the inspiration of God; the people of the West miraculously flock together from many nations into one vast body, and are led in one united army to fight against the infidels[1] in the East. The holy Sion is delivered by her sons who have hastened to her rescue from distant lands, and have conquered the aliens,[2] who had trodden under foot the holy city, and foully polluted the sanctuary of God. The execrable Saracens[3] had, by permission of divine Providence, long since crossed the border of Christendom, seized on the holy places, murdered the Christian inhabitants, and defiled with their abominations all that is sacred; but after a long period they received the punishment they merited from the arms of the Cisalpine nations.[4]

[1] *Ethnicos;* Ordericus calls the Mahomedans, indifferently, Gentiles and Pagans. Sulpitius Severus also uses the word "ethnicis" to express pagan; *historicis ethnicis,* in opposition to *sacris.*

[2] *Allophilis;* the word occurs again towards the close of c. 15 of this book, where a note will be found respecting it.

[3] *Agareni,* (descendants of Hagar?) an Arabian tribe. Dion Cassius has given an account of Trajan's expedition against them.

[4] Writing at St. Evroult, this phrase, often used by our author, would

Never, I think, was a more glorious subject presented to those who are well informed in military affairs, than that which is divinely offered to the poets and writers of our age, in the triumph of a handful of Christians, drawn from their homes by the love of enterprise, over the pagans in the East. The God of Abraham renewed his ancient miracles, when, actuated only by their zeal to visit the Messiah's tomb, and without the exercise of the authority of kings, or any worldly excitement, but by the simple admonition of Pope Urban,[1] he assembled the Christians of the West, from the ends of the earth, and the isles of the sea, as he brought the Hebrews out of Egypt by the hand of Moses; and led them through strange nations until he conducted them to Palestine, and gave them victory over kings and princes, and the assembled forces of many nations, and enabled them gloriously to conquer strongly-fortified cities, and to reduce towns under subjection to their arms.

Fulcher of Chartres, chaplain to Godfrey duke of Lorraine, who partook of the toils and perils of the expedition, has published a faithful and accurate volume on the laudable enterprise of the army of Christ.[2] Likewise Baldric, archbishop of Dol,[3] wrote four books in which he has described

include all the western nations on this side the Alps, but he generally means the French, including the Normans.

[1] Urban II. (March 12, 1088—July 29, 1099), born on the territory of Rheims, was first a canon of that cathedral, afterwards a monk of Cluni, and eventually bishop of Ostia. Gregory VII., just before his death, named him one of the three cardinals he thought qualified for the papacy. However, he was not raised to it until after the death of Victor III., who was also on Pope Gregory's list.

[2] Fulcher of Chartres, born in 1059, was not chaplain to Godfrey de Bouillon, but to his brother and successor, Baldwin. His history of the Crusades is entitled, *Gesta peregrinorum Francorum cum armis Hierusalem pergentium.* It is supposed that he died about the year 1127, the period at which his narrative ends. It will be seen hereafter that there were no less than four individuals in the first Crusade who bore the same name and surname.

[3] Baldric, or Baudri, born at Meun-sur-Loire, about the middle of the eleventh century, was made abbot of Borgueil in 1079, and archbishop of Dol in 1107. After the year 1120 he frequently resided in Normandy, particularly at the monastery of St. Samson, standing at the mouth of the Risle, it being a dependency on his see; indeed, it was the seat of an exempt jurisdiction belonging to Dol till the time of the revolution. He consecrated the church of St. Samson the 16th of December, 1129, and that

with truth of eloquence, all the details from the beginning of the journey to the first battle after the taking of Jerusalem. Many other writers also, both Greek and Latin, have given accounts of this remarkable event, and recorded in lively characters the heroic deeds of illustrious men for the benefit of posterity. I too, though the least of all the followers of the Lord in a religious rule of life, for the love I bear to the brave champions of Christ, and the desire I have to celebrate their valiant achievements, am ambitious to include in the work I have undertaken on ecclesiastical affairs some account of this Crusade. I shrink from the task of writing a complete history of the expedition, but though I cannot venture to promise that, I know not how I can pass by so grand a theme without any notice. I feel the weight of years, being now a sexagenarian,[1] and having been brought up in the strict rule of the cloister, a monk from my childhood, I am unable to undergo the severe labour of writing with my own hand, and have no penmen to take down what I wish to dictate.[2] Consequently I hasten to complete my work. I will therefore now begin the ninth book, in which I shall

Du Marais-Vernier, in the same place, on the succeeding day, and died the 7th of January following. He wrote his history of the Holy War in 1110. *Baldrici, archiepiscopi Dolensis Historia Hierosolymitana.*

[1] Our author has told us at the beginning of his fifth book (vol. ii. p. 113), that he was born the 16th of March, 1075; this part of his history was, therefore, written in 1135, a rather memorable epoch in the annals of England and Normandy, as Henry I. died on the 1st of December of that year. Ordericus, towards the close of the twenty-sixth chapter of his eighth book (see before, p. 47), incidentally furnishes us with the date in which that part of his work was written; so that it would appear the eighth and ninth books were composed consecutively.

We might be inclined to amuse ourselves with our author's remark, that his weight of years, as a sexagenarian, interfered with the prosecution of his literary avocations, if the conclusion of the sentence did not give rise to a very different feeling. But it may be well supposed that in the case of so conscientious a recluse, even a robust constitution may have been broken by the austerities of a long monastic life, and the rigid performance of his duties in the choir, as well by night as by day, and through the rigours of a winter in Normandy (such as he describes, vol. ii. pp. 110 and 244), without the addition of his indefatigable devotion to his voluminous work.

[2] Either this lack of qualified penmen must have been temporary, or there was a sad falling off during the last seventy or eighty years in the education and industry of the younger members of the society of St. Evroult, of which our author has given so pleasing an account in the earlier part of his history. See vol. i. pp. 406—408.

endeavour to give, faithfully and in order, some account of the pilgrims to Jerusalem, if God affords me the aid I need. In the deserts of Idumea, merciful Jesus, thou King of Nazareth, lend me, I beseech thee, thy powerful succour! Grant me the ability to declare worthily thy mighty power, which was exhibited in the triumph of thy servants and the discomfiture of the rebellious. Thou art the leader and guide of the faithful, their protector in dangers, their shield in battle, and the giver of victory. Almighty God! thee I adore, thy help I now implore! To the King of kings be eternal praises, world without end! Amen.

CH. II. *A general drought and famine—Remarkable appearance of "falling stars"—The council of Clermont—its decrees—Urban II. preaches the crusade—Numbers take the cross—Aimer, bishop of Puy and Raymond, count of Tholouse.*

IN the year of our Lord 1094, the second indiction, tumults and wars spread desolation over the greatest part of the world, and pitiless mortals inflicted on each other enormous calamities by rapine and slaughter. Iniquity abounded on all sides, and involved those who abandoned themselves to it in endless sufferings. The grass of the earth was burnt up by excessive drought, which destroyed the corn and pulse, so that a severe famine ensued.[1]

The emperor Henry attacked the Roman church, but by God's providence was compelled to yield to the numbers who undertook her defence. Pope Urban held a council at Piazenza, in which the peace of the church and other pressing affairs were carefully considered.[2]

[1] This melancholy picture appears to be somewhat overcharged. The populations of the west were habitually the prey of so many devastations, that the year 1094 does not seem to have been particularly distinguished, except by a pestilence which extended its ravages to France, but which was a greater scourge to Bavaria and the banks of the Rhine. The Chronicle of St. Stephen of Caen speaks also of a great drought and famine, but refers them to the year 1091; while that of St. Brieuc, on the contrary, fixes them in 1095.

[2] The cause of the emperor, Henry IV. (October 5, 1056—August 7, 1106), was indeed little prosperous in Italy at this period. His son, Conrad, who had commenced hostilities against him, caused himself to be crowned king of the Romans in 1093. The council of Piacenza sat from the 1st to the 7th of March, 1095. There were present two hundred bishops, more than four thousand of the clergy, and thirty thousand lay.

In the year of our Lord 1095, the third indiction, on Wednesday before the nones [4th] of April, on the twenty-sixth day of the moon, innumerable spectators in France witnessed such a prodigious commotion among the stars, that, but for their brightness, it might have been mistaken for a thick shower of hail. Many thought that the constellations had fallen, and that the scripture was fulfilled, which predicted when and wherefore the stars should fall from heaven.

Gilbert, bishop of Lisieux, who was now an old man and a good physician as well as deeply skilled in other sciences,[1] had long been in the habit of regularly observing the stars at night, carefully noting their courses, like an acute astrologer. The able naturalist perceiving this prodigy in the heavens, called up the watchman who guarded the house while the other servants were asleep, and said to him: "Do you see, Walter, this remarkable appearance?" The man replied: "I see it, my lord, but I know not what it portends." The old prelate answered: "It prefigures, I think, the emigration of people from one country to another. Many will depart never to return, until the stars come back to their places in the heavens, from which as it appears they are clearly wandering. Others will remain fixed in their high and lofty sphere, like bright stars shining in the firmament."

men. The ambassadors of the emperor of the East attended the council to implore the succour of the Latin Christians against the Turks, who had overrun almost all Asia Minor, and threatened Constantinople itself. It was in consequence of this, and on the present occasion, that Pope Urban first proposed the Crusade.

[1] From our author's character, in a former chapter (vol. ii. p. 121), of this prelate, Gilbert Maminot, and scattered notices throughout the history, he must have been an extraordinary person in that age, but more eminent as a man of science than as an ecclesiastic. In fact, he appears to have been raised to the episcopate by William the Conqueror as a reward for services in his medical capacity rather than as his chaplain, and he attended his sovereign as his physician in his last illness.

The author, who must have known him well, gives here a lively picture of the old bishop, who, he tells us in another place, was tall and spare in person, engaged in his nightly occupation of observing the heavens, and explaining to his astonished domestic a phenomenon with which he must himself have been familiar, but which on this occasion presented an aspect more than usually brilliant. Little did the philosophical prelate know of the modern theory of *aërolites*, and he treated the subject, as was natural, more as an astrologer than an astronomer.

This Walter, who was of Cormeilles, related to me a long time afterwards what he had heard from the mouth of the able physician concerning the falling stars, at the very moment the phenomenon was observed.

Philip, king of France, carried off Bertrade, the wife of the count of Anjou, and having repudiated his own illustrious queen, made a shameful marriage with the adulteress. He would not abandon this dishonourable connection, notwithstanding the censures of the French bishops on the criminal pair, the one for having deserted his wife, the other her husband, and the king sunk into age and infirmities in all the corruption of his foul adultery.[1]

During King Philip's reign, Pope Urban undertook a journey to France, and consecrated the altar of St. Peter at the abbey of Cluni, and many churches dedicated to the saints; and, by his apostolical authority, granted them privileges to the honour of Christ.[2] Then a dreadful pestilence raged among the population in Normandy and France, so that numbers of houses were swept of their inhabitants, while, at the same time, a severe famine wasted the people.

The same year, the fourth indiction, in the month of November, Pope Urban assembled the bishops of France and Spain in a great council at Clermont,[3] a city of Auvergne, anciently called Arverne.[4] He reformed many things on this side the Alps, and made a variety of decrees for the reformation of manners. There were present at the council

[1] The details connected with this scandalous alliance, which drew on Philip I. the thunders of the church, are given in our author's pecceding book.

[2] The pope crossed the Alps in the last fortnight of July, was at Valence in the beginning of August, at Puy the 15th, at Chaise-Dieu the 18th, at Nismes the end of the month, at Tarascon the 11th of September, at Avignon the 12th, at St. Paul-Trois Châteaux the 19th, at Maçon the 17th of October, and at Cluni the 18th. The altar at Cluni was consecrated on the 25th.

[3] The pope arrived at Clermont the 14th or 15th of November, and opening the council on the 18th, closed it on the 28th of the same month. It was at first proposed to assemble it at Vézelai, then at Puy, but at last finally settled to hold it at Clermont.

[4] The Roman name of the capital of the province of Auvergne was *Augustonemetium*, which it exchanged for that of Arvernis about the time of Ammianus Marcellinus. It preserved the latter name until it borrowed that of Clermont, a fortress built to protect and overawe it.

of Clermont thirteen archbishops, and two hundred and twenty-five bishops, with a vast number of abbots and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, to whom the care of the churches was divinely committed.[1]

The decrees of the council held at Clermont were as follows:—

"The church ought to be catholic, pure, and independent; catholic in the faith and communion of the saints; pure from all contagion of sin; and independent of all secular power. Let not bishops, abbots, or others of the clergy, receive the investiture of any ecclesiastical dignity from the hands of any prince or layman whatever! Let not clerks hold any prebends or preferment in more than one city or church! Let no one be at the same time a bishop and abbot! Let no priest, deacon, subdeacon, or canon be guilty of incontinence! and let no priest, deacon, or subdeacon perform any function after he has lapsed! Let no ecclesiastical dignities or canonries be bought or sold! Those may be pardoned who have purchased canonries in ignorance of the authority of the canons and the laws prohibiting it; but let those be deprived who hold them wittingly purchased by themselves or their relations! Let no layman eat flesh after being sprinkled with ashes on the first day of Lent until Easter! Let the first fast of the Four Times be always kept in the first week of Lent! Let holy orders be always conferred either at vespers on Saturday, or, the fast being prolonged, on Sunday morning! On Easter Saturday, let not the office be concluded till sunset! Let the second fast be always kept in the week of Whitsuntide! Let the truce of God be observed from Advent to the octave of the Epiphany, from Septuagesima until the octave of Easter, from the first Rogation day to the octave of Whitsunday, and at all seasons from sunset on Wednesday to sunrise

[1] Cotemporary writers are not agreed on these numbers, but our author has prudently adopted those which were officially stated by the pope himself in his brief in favour of the bishopric of Arras. Among the prelates we may single out Elias, archbishop of Bari, who figured in the narrative of the translation of the relics of St. Nicholas (vol. ii. pp. 393, 394), and who now, having received a visit from Peter the Hermit as he was returning from the Holy Land, accompanied him from Bari to the council of Clermont. The number of the abbots, which is not here given, is reckoned in the documents referred to at more than ninety.

on Monday! Let any one who lays violent hands on a bishop be outlawed! Let those who arrest or rob monks, clerks, or nuns, or their servants, be excommunicated! Let those who plunder the goods of bishops or clerks at their death be excommunicated! Let those who marry within the seventh degree of consanguinity be excommunicated! Let no one be made a bishop but a priest, deacon, or subdeacon,[1] and who is of honourable parentage, except in extreme cases, and with the pope's licence! The sons of priests or concubines shall not be preferred to the priesthood, unless they have before led a religious life! Those who flee to a church or cross for refuge, shall, if guilty, be given up to justice, saving only life and limbs; but if they are innocent they shall be set at liberty! Let the body of our Lord and the blood of our Lord be received separately! Let every church possess its own tithes, and not intrude on the rights of another under pretence of any gift! Let no layman either sell or hold tithes! Let no fees be demanded or paid for the burial of the dead! Let no prince have any chaplain, unless by licence from the bishop; and if he be guilty of any offence, let him be corrected by the diocesan, and another chaplain appointed in his place!" [2]

These decrees received the public sanction of Pope Urban at the council of Clermont, where he zealously inforced the observance of the divine law on all orders of men. He then laid before the council lamentable accounts of the desolation of Christianity in the East, and described the sufferings and cruel oppressions to which the faithful were exposed.[3] His eyes filled with tears as he depictured to

[1] Gregory II. was only a deacon when he was elected pope.

[2] It must not be concluded that the acts of the council of Clermont were confined to this small number of canons; on the contrary, they were so numerous that the very circumstance has occasioned the loss of the greater part, every one limiting himself to extracting only what particularly interested him. The general collection of councils contains all that have been preserved by Lambert D'Arras, Alberic de Trois-Fontaines, and others.

[3] The calamities on which the pope expatiated are those which resulted from the conquest of Jerusalem and the whole of Lower Syria, in 1076, by the lieutenants of Malek-Shah, great-nephew of Togul-Bey, and Sultan of the Turkish dynasty of the Seljucides. The Christians of the Holy Land had already undergone great sufferings from the cruelties of the

the sacred synod Jerusalem prostrate, and the holy places, where Christ and his disciples walked in the flesh, profaned and trodden down. Then many of his audience were moved by sympathy and compassion for their afflicted brethren to weep with him. The eloquent preacher addressed his hearers in a long and excellent discourse, in which he exhorted the princes of the West, with their subjects and warriors, to maintain firm peace among themselves, and, assuming the badge of the holy cross on their right shoulders, give full scope to their military ardour on the renowned chiefs of the Infidels.

"The Turks and Persians," said Pope Urban, "the Arabians and Saracens, have seized Antioch, Nice, and Jerusalem itself,[1] ennobled by the tomb of Christ, with other Christian cities, and have now turned their immense power against the empire of the Greeks. They are in complete possession of Palestine and Syria, which they have already subjugated, destroying the churches, and butchering the Christians like sheep. In the churches, where the divine sacrifice was once celebrated by the faithful, the gentiles now stable their horses, introducing their superstitions and idolatries, have shamefully expelled the Christian religion from the temples dedicated to God. The domains given for the support of the saints, and the endowments of the nobles for the sustenance of the poor, are usurped by pagan tyranny, and converted by these cruel masters to their own use. They have dragged away many captives into far distant countries, the seats of barbarism, and yoking them with thongs, set them to labour in the fields, compelled them to plough the land like oxen, and to undergo other toils befitting beasts rather than men. Worn down with the fatigue of such employments, our brethren are flogged with whips, urged with goads, and abominably subjected to innumerable sufferings. In Africa alone ninety-six bishop-

Fatimite Calipl., Hakem (996—1002), to whose successors they continued subject until this invasion which restored them nominally to the government of the Abassides.

[1] The date of the conquest of Jerusalem by the Turks has been given in the last note. Nice was ceded to Soliman, sultan of Iconium by Nicephorus Melisenes in 1080, and Antioch by the son of Philaretes in 1085.

ries have been destroyed, as those who have come from thence inform us." [1]

No sooner had Pope Urban eloquently poured forth these complaints in the ears of Christians,[2] than, by the inspiration of God's grace, thousands were inflamed with excessive zeal for undertaking the enterprise, and resolved to sell their lands and leave all they had for the sake of Christ. Rich and poor, monks and clerks, townsmen and peasants, were all seized with wonderful ardour to march to Jerusalem or to succour those that became pilgrims. Husbands were ready to leave their beloved wives at home, and wives were equally desirous to leave their children and all their substance, and accompany their husbands on the journey. Estates of great value were sold for a trifle, and arms were purchased to inflict divine vengeance on the Saracens. Robbers, pirates, and other criminals, touched by the grace of God, rose from the depths of iniquity, confessed and renounced their sins, and, to make satisfaction to God for them, joined the ranks of the pilgrims. The prudent pope stirred up all who were able to bear arms, to fight against the enemies of God, absolving by his authority all penitents from the hour they should take the cross from their sins, and releasing them from all obligations of fasting and other mortifications of the flesh. For he wisely considered, like a kind and prudent physician, that those who went on the pilgrimage would be constantly harassed on the road by difficulties of all kinds, and exposed to daily chances both for good or evil, for which the worthy servants of Christ should be purified from all the corruptions of sin.

[1] Among the numerous discourses attributed by the historians of the first Crusade to Urban II. at the council of Clermont, there are three which have the character of authenticity. The first, which is rather the fragment of an allocution particularly addressed to the French than a complete discourse, is preserved by Robert of St. Remi; the second by Balderic; the third by William of Tyre. They are all to be found in the general collection of councils, as well as in the history of this pope by Dom Ruinart.—*Ouvres Posthumes de Mabillon.*

[2] It is said that this popular eloquence was displayed by Pope Urban from a lofty scaffold in the market place of Clermont. The city was filled with overflowing numbers, and, though the council was held, as we have seen, in the month of November, thousands sheltered themselves in tents hastily erected in the open fields round the town.

While the pope was solemnly preaching in the council, and vehemently exhorting the sons of Jerusalem to hasten to deliver their holy mother, a man of high character, Adhemar,[1] bishop of Puy, rose from his place before all the assembly, and approaching the successor of the apostles with a cheerful countenance, bent his knee, and entreated permission to go, and the pope's benediction; both which he obtained to the joy of all. Thereupon the pope issued a decree enjoining all the pilgrims to obey the bishop, and constituting him apostolical vicar in the expedition; for he was a prelate of consummate ability, great courage, and singular industry.

The envoys of Raymond Berenger, count of Tholouse,[2] presently appeared, and announced to the pope that their master, with many thousands from his dukedom, would join the Crusade, and stated to the council that he had already assumed the cross. Lo! thanks be to God, two leaders voluntarily presented themselves with alacrity to take the command of the Christian pilgrims. In this case, the priestly and princely powers, the order of the clergy and that of the laity, united to be the conductors of the people of God. The bishop and the count remind us of Moses and Aaron, who were also aided by the divine support. There was an eclipse of the moon on the tenth day of the month of February, which lasted from midnight to the dawn

[1] The MS. of St. Evroult, following the text of Archbishop Baudri's narrative, always calls this prelate *Naimarus*, which should be written *N'Aimarus*, the initial *N* being an abbreviation of *Don* for *Dominus*, used in the south of France in the middle ages. The real name of the bishop of Puy was Adhémar—and by contraction Aimar—de Monteil. He was raised to the episcopacy about the year 1080, at the latest. The composition of the Hymn, *Salve Regina*, in the office of the Blessed Virgin, is attributed to Adhémar.

[2] Raymond, fourth of that name, and surnamed de St. Giles, was the second son of Pons, count of Tholouse. At first he was lord of that part of the bishopric of Nismes, which adjoins St Giles, but his brother William, who married Emma, daughter of Robert, count de Mortain, gave him the county of Rovergue in 1066, and that of Tholouse in 1088. William went to the Holy Land in 1092, and died there the year following. Raimond was accompanied to the Crusade by his third wife, Elvira, natural daughter of Alfonzo VI., king of Léon and Castile, with a son he had by her, who was quite young, and whose name has not been preserved.

of morning, the obscuration commencing on the north side of the planet.[1]

CH. III. *A synod of the bishops of Normandy, held at Rouen, promulgates the canons of the council of Clermont—Origin of the Danes who conquered Normandy — State of the province—Duke Robert resolves to join the Crusade.*

ODO, bishop of Bayeux, Gilbert of Evreux, and Serlo of Séez, with envoys from the other bishops of Normandy, bearing letters of apology, were present at the council of Clermont, and returning with the apostolical benediction, brought synodal letters to their brother bishops. In consequence, Archbishop William convoked a synod at Rouen, to consult with his suffragan bishops on the wants of the church. Having assembled at Rouen, in the month of February, they unanimously received the acts of the council of Clermont, and, ratifying the apostolical decrees, made a record to the following purpose for a perpetual memorial:—

"1. The holy synod has decreed that the truce of God shall be strictly observed from the Sunday before the beginning of Lent to sunrise on Monday after the octave of Whitsuntide; also from Wednesday before Advent at sunset to the octave of the Epiphany, as well as every week in the year from sunset on Wednesday to sun-rise on Monday;[2] also on all the feasts of St. Mary, and their vigils, and all feasts of the apostles, and their vigils; so that no one shall assault, or wound, or slay another, or take pledge[3] or booty.

[1] This eclipse happened in the night between the 10th and 11th of February, at half-past three in the morning.

[2] According to this canon, there remained only the three first days of the week for carrying on hostilities. This was so totally inconsistent with the military spirit of the age, that the canon, by attempting too much, became quite nugatory, as our author states in the succeeding chapter, in commenting on the decrees of this council, promulgated by the synod of Rouen. See the note in p. 125 of vol. ii. on the introduction of the "truce of God" into Normandy.

[3] *Namnum.* The same word is used in S. 19 of the canons of the synod of Rouen in 1080. (*ib.* p. 128.) We have there given it the signification of a gage or pledge of *battle*. M. Le Prevost considers it an ordinary pledge, which generally consisted of cattle, and remarks that there is a street at Caen called, *La rue aux Namps*.

"2. It is also decreed that all churches and churchyards, monks, and nuns, as well as females, pilgrims and merchants, with their servants, oxen, and horses at plough, and men driving carts, or harrowing, and horses harrowing, and men flying for refuge to carts, and all the lands of the saints, and the money of the clergy, shall be for ever unmolested, so that no one shall presume to assault, take, rob, or injure them in any manner or at any time whatever.[1]

"3. It is also decreed that all persons, from the age of twelve years and upwards, shall swear to observe faithfully this institution of the truce of God as it is here appointed, by the oath following, 'You N. hear this; I swear that henceforth I will faithfully observe this appointment of the truce of God as it is here expressed, and will aid my bishop or archdeacon against all persons who shall neglect to take this oath, or fail to observe this decree: so that if I am summoned by them against the offenders, I will neither abscond nor conceal myself, but will attend them armed, and support them in all things to the utmost of my power, in good faith, without subterfuge, and according to my conscience. So help me God, and these saints.'[2]

"4. Likewise, the holy synod hath decreed that excommunication shall be pronounced on all who refuse to take this oath, or shall violate this decree; as well as on those who have any communication with them, or sell them goods, whether workmen, or other tradesmen; and also priests who shall permit them to communicate, or perform any divine office for them. Excommunication shall also be extended to all forgers, thieves, and receivers of stolen goods, and to freebooters banded together in strongholds for the purpose of pillaging, and to all lords who shall shelter them in their castles. And we prohibit, by the apostolical authority and our own, all Christian men from so doing on the lands of their lords.

[1] This canon is remarkable, because it appears to confer on carts and waggons in the country a sort of right of asylum for those who should take refuge in them, independently of the protection granted to persons engaged in husbandry, if, by implication we may include those not actually employed in harrowing, or carting, such as reapers, &c.

[2] *Isti sancti*. Meaning probably *the* saints on whose relics the oath was sworn.

"5. The holy synod hath also decreed that all churches shall have the same fiefs in their possession as they had in the time of King William, with the same rights and customs, and that no layman shall have any share in the third part of the tithes, or in burial fees, or in oblations at the altar, nor shall require any service or exact anything in respect of the same, save what was established in the reign of King William.

"6. It is also decreed that no layman shall institute or dismiss a priest from his church without the bishop's consent, nor sell his patronage, or receive any money for it. Also, that no man shall wear long hair, but every one shall have it cut short as becomes a Christian;[1] otherwise he shall be sequestrated from entering the doors of holy mother church, and no priest shall perform any divine office for him or assist at his burial. Let no layman assume episcopal rights, or the jurisdiction which belongs to the cure of souls.[2]

"7. Let no priest do homage to a layman, because it is not fit that hands dedicated to God, and consecrated with the sacred chrism, should be placed within those which are unhallowed, and may belong to a murderer, an adulterer, or one who has committed some other grievous sin.[3] If, however, a priest holds of a layman any fief which is not ecclesiastical, let him perform fealty for his security's sake!"

Gilbert, bishop of Evreux, who was surnamed the Crane, because he was very tall, and Fulbert, archdeacon of Rouen,[4] promulgated these decrees, which Archbishop William and the other bishops ratified by their authority; Odo of Bayeux,

[1] Not only was the hair worn short at this time, but the chin was shaved. The Crusaders having suffered their beards to grow before the battle of Antioch, either as a token of sorrow, or to disguise the emaciation of their faces, it was very difficult to distinguish them from the Musulmans, so that the bishop of Puy was forced to recommend their wearing crosses on their garments, to avoid serious mistakes. The fashion of long beards, which was introduced into Normandy a few years later, to the great scandal, as our author has told us before, of the stricter sort, was therefore, it should seem, as yet but little in vogue in the West.

[2] This canon cannot be considered unnecessary in a country where we have seen (vol. i. p. 471) an archdeaconry held as an hereditary lay fief.

[3] We have here Gregory the Seventh's peremptory decision of the celebrated question of investitures, which for so many years convulsed Europe.

[4] For this person see before pp. 38, 39.

Gilbert of Lisieux, Turgis of Avranches,[1] Serlo of Séez, and Ralph of Coutances,[2] gave their sanction to the synod, and the abbots from the whole of Normandy, with the clergy and those of the nobles who were desirous of peace, assisted at it. The bishops, indeed, with the best intentions made such statutes as the times required, but as the laws were not enforced by the prince, they little availed to secure the tranquillity of the church, and all that was now ordained in the manner we have described was nearly useless. For at that time there were extraordinary feuds among the Norman barons, and the people throughout the country engaged in enterprises of violence and robbery, so that the whole land was devastated by ravages and flames. A great number of the inhabitants were driven from their homes, and the parishes being depopulated, the priests sought safety in flight from their ruined churches.

The Normans are a turbulent race, and, unless restrained by a firm government, are always ready for mischief. In all societies wherever they are found, they struggle for the mastery, and disregarding all the sanctions of truth and good faith, are incessantly actuated by a fiery ambition. The French, the Bretons, the Flemings, and the other neighbours of the people of Normandy, have but too often had reason to be sensible of this, and the Italians, Lombards, and Anglo-Saxons, have suffered from it even to extermination.

The origin of the Trojans may be traced, as it is reported, to the barbarous tribes of the Scythians; and after the ruin of Troy, Antenor, the Phrygian, penetrated into Illyrium, and sought for a long time a settlement for himself and his companions in exile. At last, he fixed his abode on the shore of the Northern ocean, and having with his fellow emigrants colonized the sea-coast, they left their possessions to their heirs. The race thus sprung from the Trojans, took the name of Danes, from Danus, son of Antenor.[3] They

[1] 1094–1133.

[2] 1093–1110.

[3] This fabulous account of the origin of the Danes from Trojan emigrants corresponds with that attributed by the chroniclers of the middle ages to the Britons and other nations of the West and North of Europe. Archæologists are now pretty well agreed in assigning an eastern origin to

were always a fierce and warlike people and governed by powerful kings; but it was long before they submitted to receive the Christian faith. Rollo, one of their bravest chiefs, with the Normans, were of this race; and being the first who subjugated Neustria, it took from them the name of Normandy, Norman signifying in English, *Northman*. Norman means therefore *a man of the north*, whose rude assaults have proved not less destructive to their dainty neighbours than the nipping blasts of the north wind to tender flowers. To this day their descendants inherit the native fierceness of the race and their ardour for war, so that they never suffer the tillers of the soil or even their own governors to have any peace in their homes.

After Rollo, a succession of valiant dukes commanded the warlike Normans; namely, William Long-sword, Richard the elder, Richard II., son of Gunnor, and his two sons, Richard the younger and Robert of Jerusalem, and then William the Bastard. This duke, the last in order of time, surpassed all his predecessors in his warlike achievements and grandeur, and at his death left the duchy of Normandy to Robert, and the kingdom of England to William. But Robert, a weak prince, degenerated from the vigour of his ancestors, and sunk in sloth and luxury, had more fear of his own subjects than they had of him, and consequently a mischievous insubordination gained ground in every part of his territories. One of his brothers, Prince Henry, had possession of Damfront, a very strong castle, from whence he held great part of Normandy in subjection either by his policy or his arms, and befriended his brother or opposed him, according to his own pleasure. The other brother, who was king of England, held more, I think, than twenty castles in Normandy, and attached to his cause either by fear or reward many of the most powerful barons and lords of castles. Robert, count d'Eu,[1] Stephen d'Albermarle,[2] Gerard de Gournai,[3] Ralph de Conches,[4] with Robert, earl of

the Scandinavian peoples, but derived through tribes which emigrated at a very early period from the vast plains of central Asia.

[1] It should be Henry, not Robert, count d'Eu, Robert being Henry's grandfather, who died before the year 1093.

[2] Or Aumale, cousin-german of Duke Robert.

[3] Gerard, lord of Gournai, son of Hugh, and of Basile, daughter of Gerard Fleitel.

[4] Ralph de Conches, the second of that name, who died in 1102.

Morton,[1] Walter Giffard,[2] Philip de Braiouse,[3] and Richard de Courci,[4] and many other lords submitted to the king, with all the fortresses and garrisons belonging to them, and trembling at his nod supported him with all their power. Thus Normandy was a prey to the distractions of her own children, and the unarmed people had no protector.

Roused to reflection by these calamities, and fearing still worse, as he was deserted by almost every one, duke Robert resolved, by the advice of some men of religion to leave the government of his dominions to his brother the king, and taking the cross, join the pilgrimage to Jerusalem in satisfaction of his sins. The king of England heard this determination with sincere pleasure, and approving the design received Normandy to hold it for five years, advancing his brother ten thousand silver marks[5] to enable him to undertake the pilgrimage.

CH. IV. *The crusade preached by Peter the Hermit—Vast multitudes assume the cross and set out on the pilgrimage to Jerusalem—Enumeration of the chief crusaders and their principal followers.*

POPE Urban held another council at Tours in the Lent following and confirmed in it the acts of the council of Clermont. In the middle of Lent he consecrated the church of St. Nicholas at Anjou, and conferred on it apostolical privileges. He also by his influence and authority effected the liberation of Geoffrey Martel count of Anjou, who had been traitorously seized and confined in the castle of Chinon

[1] Robert, Count of Mortaine (called in England earl of Morton), surnamed Le Prud'homme, 1082–5, June, 1118.

[2] Walter Giffard, second of that name, count de Longueville, and earl of Buckingham in England, who died in 1102.

[3] Philip, lord of Briouse, department of the Orne, son of William de Briouse, who granted several charters in favour of St. Florence at Saumur, which have been preserved. William was present at the battle of Hastings. The Berkeleys, and we believe the Howards, claim ancient baronies of this name, written also Braiouse and Breouse, in England.

[4] Richard de Courci. For this person, see before, vol. ii. p. 505.

[5] The silver mark was worth in these times 160 pennies; and a pound weight of silver was coined into 240 pennies. This sum which is equal, M. Le Prévost observes, to 6,666 *livres d'argent*, was paid to Robert Curthose in the month of September. We shall see hereafter, from the details given by our author of the means employed to collect this sum, that its payment did not much exhaust the treasury of William Rufus.

for nearty thirty years by his younger brother Fulk Richer, who in the meantime usurped his dominions.[1]

In the year of our Lord 1096, the fourth indiction, in the month of March, Peter d'Acheri, a monk[2] eminent for his learning and liberality commenced his pilgrimage from France to the Holy Land, and led with him Walter de Poissi,[3] with his nephews, Walter, surnamed Sans-Avoir,[4]

[1] Ordericus has inverted the order of events in this paragraph. It was on the 6th of February that the pope went from Poitiers to Angers, and on the 10th or 11th, he dedicated the church of St. Nicholas. If Geoffrey-le-Barbu was liberated from the prison in which he had been confined since 1068 (not as is erroneously stated, vol. i. p. 440, on the 4th of April, 1067), his brother, having relaxed his custody in the interval, it could only have been at a later period. This Geoffrey is here confounded with his nephew Geoffrey Martel, fourth of that name. From Angers the pope proceeded by way of Sablé (14th of February), Mans (16th–18th of February), and Vendôme (19th of February, 2nd of March) to Tours, where he held a council in the third week of Lent (16th–23rd of March).

[2] This was the famous Peter-the-Hermit. The enthusiasm for this preacher of the crusade was raised to such a pitch that, according to Guibert of Nogent, people scrambled for the hairs plucked from the tail of his mule. Our author is incorrect in describing him here as a monk; he did not embrace the religious life until after his return from the Holy Land, when he founded a priory of regular canons at Neumostier (*Novum Monasterium*), in the suburbs of the town of Huy, in the bishopric of Liege, where he died the 6th of June, 1115, at the age of 62 years. He was, therefore, only 43, and probably a married man, when he took so active a part in the first crusade.

Peter's surname was probably derived from Acheri, Acheux, or some other locality with a corresponding name near Amiens, of which district he was a native. Our author, like many others, was deceived by his being called *the Hermit*, which did not mean that he had embraced the life of an anchorite, but was his family name. His father Reginald l'Ermite had borne it before him, and it was preserved by his descendants. Several noble families in different parts of France of this name have endeavoured in consequence to establish their connection with this celebrated individual.

The foundation of Neumostier was the result of a vow made by Peter-the-Hermit and Lambart-the-Poor, count of Clermont, son of Conrad count de Montagu, and nephew of Godfrey de Bouillon, during a storm at sea which threatened their lives, while returning together from the Holy Land in 1105. The grave of Peter-the-Hermit was violated at the revolution, and his remains dispersed, but his tombstone is still preserved by the present proprietor of Neumostier.

[3] Walter de Poissi; probably the same person mentioned before (vol. ii. p. 219) as son-in-law of Peter de Maule. It appears by a succeeding paragraph that he died early in the pilgrimage.

There is a place of this name not far from Poissi, Boissi-sans-Avoir, of which this soldier of the cross was perhaps a native.

William, Simon, and Matthew, and other gallant French knights, with a crowd of nearly fifteen thousand persons who travelled on foot. He reached Cologne on the Saturday of Easter,[1] and rested there during the following week, but was still employed in his good work. Having preached to the Germans, fifteen thousand of them were persuaded to take part in the service of the Lord and he was joined by two powerful counts, Berthold and Hildibert,[2] and a bishop, who proceeded with him through Germany and Hungary.[3] Meanwhile, the impatient Frenchmen were unwilling to wait for Peter while he tarried at Cologne, and endeavoured to augment and strengthen his forces by preaching God's word, and they continued their journey through Hungary without him. Columban, the king of the Huns,[4] was at that time favourable to the pilgrims and supplied them with means of subsistence while they were in his territories. At length, having crossed the Danube, they passed through Bulgaria, and arriving in Cappadocia, waited there till they were joined by Peter and the Germans who were in their rear.[5]

Intelligence of the apostolical mandate having been quickly spread throughout the world, those of all nations who were predestined to enlist under the banner of the mighty Messiah, were roused to action. Its thunders echoed through England and the other islands of the ocean, nor were they drowned by the roar of the waves which, in

[1] Saturday, 12th of April.

[2] These names are not found in the narrative of Balderic nor in any other history of which we have any knowledge. The German bands who took the van in this expedition, were led, the first by Folkmar, the second by Godeschalk, and the third by Count Emichon.

[3] We have no other account of a bishop who ventured his person in company with these undisciplined hordes. Otho, indeed, bishop of Strasburg (1085—August 3, 1100), joined the first crusade, but it is believed that he attached himself to Godfrey.

[4] Coloman, son and successor of St. Ladislaus, 1095—February 3, 1114. From the time that St. Stephen, king of Hungary, 997—1038, had, with the zeal of a neophyte, treated the pilgrims who passed through his states in their way to the Holy Land with the most generous hospitality, this road was preferred to the voyage by sea, before universally adopted.

[5] It was not in Cappadocia, but under the walls of Constantinople, that the emperor Alexius stationed the Franks who preceded Peter-the-Hermit, while waiting his arrival. They reached Constantinople about the 1st of August.

their deep channels, separate those islands from the rest of the world. The report swelling with increased fervour, roused to arms the Gascons, the Bretons, and the Gallicians, the furthest of men.[1] The Venetians also, and the Pisans and Genoese, and other maritime states on the Ocean and the Mediterranean, covered the sea with ships freighted with arms and troops, engines of war, and provisions. Those who journeyed by land darkened the whole face of the earth like locusts.[2] In the month of June Walter de Poissi died at Phinoplis in Bulgaria, and the sign of the cross was discovered on his body after his death.[3] The governor and bishop of the city, hearing of this prodigy conducted Walter's corpse into the place, and buried it with reverence; they also granted free access to the other pilgrims which they refused before, allowing them to buy what they wanted.

The same year, Hugh the Great, count de Crépi,[4] entrusted his estates to his sons Ralph and Henry,[5] and giving his daughter Isabel in marriage to Robert count de Mellent,[6] undertook the pilgrimage, accompanied by a noble band of

[1] Gallicia, in the extreme N.W. of Spain.

[2] The numbers of the needy and undisciplined band of adventurers, the refuse of the people, who anticipated the advance of the organized bodies of Crusaders was estimated at 200,000 souls, only one third of whom escaped the retaliation their aggressions merited, and arrived under the walls of Constantinople. The flower of European chivalry, afterwards mustered, furnished 100,000 knights with their attendants in full armour on horseback. Archbishop Baldric estimates the whole number of pilgrims bearing arms, besides women and children, who in successive divisions set forth on the crusade, at 600,000 men.

[3] There was a city on the Bosphorus called Phinopolis above Buyukdere, but the place here spoken of is Philippopolis, which Villehardouin always calls Finepople. The miracle here spoken of by our author occurred so frequently, and in the case of persons of so questionable a character, that it entirely lost its credit.

[4] Hugh the Great, brother of Philip I., king of France, became count of Crépi and Valois by his marriage (about 1068) with Adela, daughter of Herbert IV., count of Vermandois; by which title Hugh is also known.

[5] Ralph, count of Vermandois, 1117—October 14, 1151. Henry, lord of Chaumont in the Vexin, died in 1130.

[6] Elizabeth, or Isabel, married to Robert, third of that name, count de Mellent. This union, which was attended with difficulty on account of the relationship established through Ive of Chartres between the parties, was celebrated shortly before the departure of the count of Vermandois for the crusade.

Frenchmen. At the same time, Stephen, count de Blois,[1] son of Theobald, count de Chartres, who was son-in-law of William, king of England, took the cross and departed for Jerusalem. Some other earls and men of rank also joined in the expedition for the love of Christ, among whom were Guy Troussel, nephew of Guy, count of Château-Fort,[2] Milo de Brai,[3] Centor de Briere,[4] Ralph de Bauguenci,[5] Everard du Poiset,[6] William Carpenter,[7] Dreux de Monci,[8] with several other barons and distinguished knights.

Peter the Hermit had preceded the army, and arrived at Constantinople with a number of Germans and French.

[1] Stephen, count de Blois, "the richest and the most eloquent of the crusaders." See an account of his family and character, vol. ii. p. 182.

[2] Guy Troussel, lord of Mont Chéri nephew of Guy the Red, lord of Rochefort-in-Yveline and Chateaufort, seneschal of France, held that office himself, until he lost it after his disgraceful flight from Antioch, when it was restored to his uncle.

[3] Milo the Great, or Miles, lord of Mont Chéri and Brai-sur-Seine, father of Guy Troussel, had married about the year 1070, Litheuil, hereditary viscountess of Troyes, and founded in 1064 the priory of Longpont.

[4] Our author, who has just ranked a son before his father, now transfers one of the bravest knights of the count of Tholouse to the followers of Hugh the Great, besides mis-spelling his name.

This person is Centule, viscount of Bearn, after his father Gaston IV., whom he accompanied to the Holy Land, where we shall presently find that he acquired great distinction.

[5] Ralph, lord of Baugenci, about 1080, was one of the most distinguished warriors of his age. He was son and successor of Lancelin II., and died before 1130, having contracted a second marriage with Matilda, daughter of Hugh the Great.

[6] Everard, son of Hugh, the first of that name, and lord of Puiset, near Janvile. The hostilities of this family with Philip I. and Lewis-le-Gros are well known, and the sieges they stood against these kings in their castle of Puiset, built by Queen Constance. Everard was father-in-law of Roger de Montgomery; see before note p. 33.

[7] William, viscount de Melun, son of Ursion, was surnamed the Carpenter, on account of the extraordinary strength of his arm. He appears to have been a cousin of Hugh the Great. We shall find hereafter that he had already fought against the infidels in Spain, and that the campaign did not turn out more honourable for him than that at Antioch.

[8] This person was probably the father of Dreux de Monchi, who, in 1146, was one of the followers of Lewis the Younger to the Holy Land. At a later period Matthew de Monchi went there with St. Lewis, and Ansel de Monchi signalized himself by a victory at the siege of Nyssa. The estate which gave its name to this illustrious family is Monchi-Cayeu near St. Pol in Artois.

He found there a crowd of Lombards, Longobards,[1] and Germans, who had outstripped him, and received the emperor's orders to make provision for the expected army. Meanwhile, he gave them permission to traffic in the city, as was just, but he prohibited them from crossing the straits of St. George,[2] until the great body of the pilgrims for which they were waiting should come up. "If," he said, "you do otherwise, the barbarous tribes will fall upon you and destroy the unarmed crowds." And so it happened; for this multitude, which flocked together from all nations, without king or general, were under no regular discipline, but lived by plunder; stripping the lead from the roofs of churches and selling it, pillaging the palaces of the rich, and abandoning themselves to all sorts of misconduct. The emperor, learning this, was much incensed at the ingratitude with which his kindness was repaid: he therefore expelled them from the city, and compelled them to cross over the strait. Having accomplished the passage, they again committed great outrages on the Christian population, devastating their lands, as if they were an enemy's army, and setting fire to their houses and churches. At length they reached Nicomedia, where the Ligurians and other nations separated from the French, who were more fierce and unmanageable, and therefore more disposed for evil. The others, therefore, chose one Reynold their leader, and under his command entered Romania.[3] Having made four days' journey beyond Nice, they reached a place called Exerogorgan,[4] which they took possession of, intending to halt there. It was full of stores of all descriptions, but it is not known whether the inhabit-

[1] Our author frequently thus distinguishes, though rather strangely, the two branches of the Lombard nation, those of the north of Sicily, and those who made settlements in the south (in Apulia and Calabria), which afterwards fell into the hands of the Normans.

[2] The Bosphorus, anciently called the Hellespont, was named in the middle ages the Strait of St. George, from a monastery dedicated to St. George of Mangana, situated at its entrance. There was attached to it a palace of the same name, to which the empress Mary, widow of Michael Parapenaces, retired in 1081.

[3] Romania, or the country of Roum, as it is named by the Arabs, is the part of Asia Minor lying to the south of Constantinople, which still continued to own the dominion of the Greek emperor.

[4] M. Pojoulat has discovered the ruins of this castle four leagues and a half from Civitot. It is now called *Eski-Kaleh*, the old castle.

ants deserted it through fear, or intentionally. Here the Germans were surrounded by the Turks, and almost all cut off to a man, as will be shown in the sequel.

In the month of September,[1] Robert, duke of Normandy, put William king of England, in possession of his dominions, and having received from him ten thousand silver marks, set forth on the crusade at the head of large bodies of troops, both horse and foot, formidable enough to strike terror into the enemy. He was accompanied by his uncle Odo, bishop of Bayeux, by Philip the Clerk,[2] son of Earl Roger, Rotro son of Geoffrey, earl of Morton,[3] and Walter, count of St. Valeri, nephew of Richard the younger, duke of Normandy, by his daughter Papia;[4] also by Gerald de Gournai,[5] Ralph de Guader, the Breton,[6] Hugh count de St. Pol,[7] Ives and Alberic, sons of Hugh de Grantmesnil,[8] and many other knights of great gallantry.

[1] It appears that the duke of Normandy did not set out on his journey until late in the month of September. At least one of his companions, William de Wasto signed a charter at Fécamp on the 9th of that month. Nor till the beginning of the month did William Rufus leave England to carry over the money he had engaged to pay his brother, and receive the dukedom of Normandy as a pledge for its repayment.

[2] Philip, fifth son of Roger de Montgomery and Mabel, countess of Alençon. This young nobleman died at the siege of Antioch. The surnames of Clerk and Grammarian, given him by the contemporary historians, prove that he had received an education above the ordinary level of the age.

[3] Rotrou, the second of that name, succeeded his father as Count de Perche.

[4] Walter, lord, not count, of St. Valeri-sur-Somme, eldest brother of Gilbert d'Aufai.

[5] Gerald de Gournai had given up his castles to William Rufus in 1089, as we find in the preceding book.

[6] Ralph de Guader, who had been earl of Norfolk in England (see vol. ii. pp. 49, and 78—82), and having forfeited his rank for treason to the Conqueror, retired to his patrimonial estates in Brittany, Gaël, and Montfort-la-Caune.

[7] Hugh de Champ-d'Avène, count of St. Pol in Artois (1083—1130 or 1131), accompanied Duke Robert in the first crusade. Enguerrard his son was killed at the siege of Marrah. We are not informed what led the count of St. Pol to join the duke of Normandy in this expedition, rather than the count of Flanders, his suzerain lord.

[8] The fourth and fifth sons of Hugh de Grantmesnil and Adeliza or Alice, daughter of Ives, count of Beaumont-sur-Oise, by Judith, his first wife.

Likewise, Godfrey, duke of Lorraine, with Baldwin and Eustace, count de Boulogne, his brothers,[1] and Baldwin, count de Mons,[2] Robert, marquis of Flanders, nephew of Matilda, queen of England,[3] and Rainard, the Teutonic,[4] with many thousand men-at-arms, quitted their homes for the love of Christ, and voluntarily departed for foreign countries to crush the Infidels and succour the Christians, taking the road through Hungary. Adhemar, bishop of Puy, and Raymond de Tholouse, safely traversed Sclavonia, being favourably received by Bodin, king of the Sclaves.[5] Meanwhile, Robert the Norman, with Stephen de Blois, his brother-in-law, Hugh the Great, and Robert the Fleming,

[1] These three lords were sons of Eustace II., count of Boulogne, by Ida of Ardennes, daughter of Godfrey IV., duke of Lorraine and Brabant. After the death of his uncle, Godfrey V., surnamed the Hunchback, and the forfeiture of Conrad, eldest son of the emperor Henry IV., Godfrey of Bouillon was invested, in 1089, with their two duchies. Of all the noble soldiers who assumed the cross, he was the most prudent, moderate, and pious. The barons of France, Germany, and Lorraine, with their vassals, comprising a force of 80,000 foot and 10,000 horse, marched under his banner.

[2] Baldwin, count of Hainault, son of Baldwin de Mons and Richilde, heiress of Hainault.

[3] Robert of Jerusalem, who was cousin-german of the duke of Normandy, succeeded his father, Robert the Frisian, in 1093. He displayed during the crusade, rather the courage and daring of a man-at-arms than the capacity of a chief.

[4] It is supposed that Rainard, count de Toul, 1076—1117, and son of Frederic II., is here spoken of. This baron, as well as Peter, his brother and successor, were in the first crusade.

[5] Illyrium, occupied by Sclavonic tribes. Bodin was not king of Esclavonia, but of Servia and Dalmatia. Still he is called king of Esclavonia, Russia, and Bulgaria by the chroniclers of Bari, who relate his marriage in 1081 with Jacintha Joannaci, daughter of Argyros Joannaci, governor of that city. He even attempted, in 1074, to wrest Bulgaria from the Greek emperor, while expecting to succeed his grandfather, Michael, king of Servia. The passage through Illyria, along the coast of the Adriatic, was not effected in the peaceable manner our author represents. It became necessary to carry by assault Scodra, now the Albanian Scutari, and dense fogs, which lasted forty days, greatly impeded the movements of the army. Between Durazzo and Constantinople, the bishop of Puy was exposed to great dangers by attacks from the Petscheneyes, and on one occasion they even got possession of his person. The division under the count of Thoulouse, reached Constantinople the last but one. See the narrative of Raymond d'Agiles for the details of his march through Dalmatia, Illyrium, and Macedonia.

and several others, crossed the Alps into Italy, and visiting Rome in peace, went and passed the winter in Apulia and Calabria.[1] The Duke Roger, surnamed Bursa,[2] received the Duke of Normandy and his companions with the honours which belonged to his natural lord, and supplied them abundantly with all that they required. Mark Bohemond[3] was then, with his uncle Roger, count of Sicily,[2] besieging a certain castle, and upon hearing the movements of so many nobles and their people, he carefully enquired into the merits of each, and scrutinized their badges. Having satisfied himself, he ordered a rich mantle to be brought, which he cut into shreds and distributed crosses among all his followers, assuming one himself. A great number of soldiers immediately flocked to his standard, so that the aged Roger was left to carry on the siege almost alone, and being thus deserted was compelled in much mortification to return to Sicily. Meanwhile, the wise and provident Bohemond quietly made preparations for his journey and transport, and passing the sea with his nobles, and large bodies of men-at-arms, after a tranquil voyage, landed on the coast of Bulgaria.[5]

Bohemond's principal companions were—Tancred,[6] son of Eudes, the Good Marquis, the Count of Rosinolo,[7] with his

[1] This is quite incorrect, as far as concerns Hugh the Great and the count of Flanders. The first had been detained a prisoner at Constantinople for a month before the arrival of Godfrey de Bouillon on the 23rd of December. The second did not cross the Adriatic till that time, and took up his winter quarters in Albania. Raymond count of Tholouse, a veteran warrior, but haughty and obstinate, led the provincials of Auvergne and Languedoc.

[2] Roger, duke of Apulia and Calabria, son of Robert Guiscard by his second wife, Sechelgaite, had succeeded his father in 1085.

[3] Bohemond, eldest son of Robert Guiscard, and prince of Tarentum, had already matched his forces with the emperor Alexius, and come off victorious.

[4] Roger, count of Sicily, the youngest of the sons of Tancred d'Hauteville. The place which these princes were besieging was Amalfi, probably on behalf of their brother and nephew, Duke Roger.

[5] It was not in Bulgaria that Bohemond landed, but in Albania, near Andrinople, the ancient Phœnice. He embarked in the month of December.

[6] Tancred, son of Eudes the Good Marquis, by Emma, daughter of Tancred d'Hauteville. He was, therefore, Bohemond's cousin. In him we discover all the virtues of a perfect knight.

[7] *Rosinolo;* probably Roscigno, the capital of a duchy four miles from

brother, Richard of the Principality, and Ranulf his brother,[1] Robert d'Anxa,[2] and Robert de Sourdeval,[3] Robert, son of Thurstan; Herman de Cannes,[4] Umfrid, son of Ralph; Richard, son of Count Ranulf; Bartholomew Boël of Chartres, Alberede de Caniano,[5] and Umfrid-di-Monte-Scabioso;[6] all these, with their vassals, unanimously attached themselves to Bohemond, and took a solemn oath to submit to his command devoutly and constantly in their holy enterprise.

Hugh the Great, and William, son of the marquis, embarked with ease at the port of Bari, and after a quick voyage, landed at Durazzo. The governor of the place,[7] believing them to be great barons, had them arrested, and conducted under strict guard to the emperor at Constantinople. The flattering governor sought to recommend himself to the emperor by this treachery, and to prove his devotion to his service in this manner.

Salerno. This count of Roscigno, whose name appears to have been Geoffrey, is confounded by most of the historians with Gerard, son of the count of Roussillon, who also joined the first crusade, and remained in the Holy Land till 1109.

[1] These two lords were sons of William, one of the sons of Tancred d'Hauteville, to whom the principality was given by Humphrey his brother, after the death of Dreux.

[2] It has been supposed that the person here spoken of was Robert the Burgundian, of the house of Névers, lord of Sablé by his marriage with Avicia, the heiress of that fief, who, though very old, took the cross when Urban II. passed through Sablé, and appears to have died in the Holy Land. But it is rather thought that Anza, called Ansa in the Chronicle of Monte Cassino, should be Anzi, a place four leagues from Matera.

[3] Sourdeval, in the department of La Manche, near Mortain.

[4] This was the memorable Cannes of Roman History, now an obscure village of the territory of Bari, two leagues and a half from Barletta.

[5] Caniano, now Cagnano, in the further Abruzzo, two leagues N.E. of Aquila.

[6] The Chronicle of Monte Cassino calls this place *Monte Scaioso;* now Monte Scaglioso, a town in the Basilicata, in the neighbourhood of Matera, and which is said to have been built by Alexander Severus on the ruins of Metapontes. Our author has omitted in this enumeration a person of some importance—for the Chronicle of Monte Cassino names him immediately after Tancred—Robert Fitz-Gerard, who carried Bohemond's standard at the battle of Dorylæum.

[7] Tancred's brother.

[8] The Duke John Commenus, son of Isaac Commenus, and nephew of the Emperor Alexius.

CH. V. *Soliman crushes the rabble of German pilgrims, in advance of the other Crusaders—The Franks also receive a check.*

SOLIMAN, chief of the Turks,[1] had no sooner learnt that the Christians were on the march to attack the Infidels, than he assembled a great army, and laid siege to the castle of Exerogorgan where the Germans had halted. The Turks lost no time in throwing up entrenchments round the town, having driven off Reynold and his followers, who made a sally and lay in ambuscade as the enemy approached the place. Many of the Christians fell in this skirmish, but those who could retreated into the shelter of the fortifications. The trenches being completed on all sides, the assailants cut off the besieged from water, for the well and spring which supplied the town were outside the walls, but a body of the Turks were strongly posted round it, and kept incessant watch. The besieged had to suffer the horror of excessive thirst for eight days, being thus tormented on account of their grievous sins and hardness of heart, and not deserving aid from God. At last, their leader made terms with the Turks, agreeing, as far as it was in his power, to betray his comrades to them. In consequence, Reynold marched out of the place at the head of a large body of the Christians, pretending that he intended to give battle to the Turks, instead of which, he went over to them. The rest were forced to surrender on very dishonourable terms, most of them shamefully apostatizing from the faith of Christ. Those however who refused to renounce their religion were put to death, exposed as marks to be shot by arrows, separated from one another, sold for a trifle, or dragged into captivity with Count Berthold. The Christians suffered this first defeat on the third of the calends of October, [29th September], and in this manner the Germans and other nations were carried captives to Chorasan and Aleppo. But those who held firm their faith in Christ found rest in a glorious death.

[1] This could not be Soliman, the founder of the Turkish dynasty of the Seljucides, who killed himself in despair after the loss of a battle against the sultan of Aleppo in 1085, but his eldest son, Kilidge Arslan (the sacred champion), who, after a long interregnum, succeeded him in 1092.

Meanwhile the Franks[1] had marched onward as far as the town of Civitot,[2] which the emperor Alexius had lately founded, intending to place in it the English refugees after the conquest of William the Bastard, but in consequence of the assaults of the Turks he had left it unfinished. Soliman, however, elated with his victory over the Allobroges[3] and Germans, and breathing slaughter marched to Civitot, which is not far from Nice, and confident of victory, made a bold attack on the French. Peter had already returned to Constantinople, as his throng of pilgrims paid no attention to his commands. The sudden charge of the Turkish cavalry took by surprise Walter,[4] a distinguished knight, who commanded a body of troops, and he was slain with many of his followers, after a slight resistance.[5] His brother William and some others were wounded, and the Turks struck off the head of a priest while he was celebrating mass. Such of the survivors as were in a condition to make their escape fled towards the city, or concealed themselves in the marshes, woods, and mountains. Some few continued to hold the castle and killed many of their assailants. The Turks collected a vast quantity of wood in the neighbourhood, and made preparations for burning the place and the thousands who were shut up in it. But the Christians, driven to despair, boldly anticipated the manœuvre, and sallying forth threw fire among the faggots, and thus escaped the peril of being burnt. Many fell on both sides; this happened in the month of October. A great number of the pilgrims now retraced their steps in confusion, and told their misfortunes to those who having followed

[1] *Franci*. Throughout this narrative, when our author speaks of the Crusaders otherwise than under their common character of "Christians," he generally sinks their several nationalities, and designates them by the term here adopted; not the French only, but all the people of the West engaged in the enterprise, just as the term Frank has long been applied in the Levant to French, English, Italians, Germans, &c. We have therefore adopted this term in the translation.

[2] On the subject of this town, see vol. ii. p. 10. The Turkish village of *Ghemlik* now occupies the site of the ancient Civitot.

[3] Allobroges; the author probably means the Norman masters of the Lombard provinces in the south of Italy.

[4] Walter Sans-Avoir; see before, p. 75.

[5] M. Michaud places the scene of this rencontre at six leagues to the west of Nice, between the lake Ascanius and a Turkish village called *Basar-Keni*.

them in their advance had now pitched their camp before Constantinople. The emperor bought the arms of the fugitives, to prevent their committing outrages among the inhabitants in a country to which they were strangers. The others waited for the arrival of their allies, that having consulted together, and having the support of the chiefs embarked in the cause and of the regular troops, and having implored the favour of God with prayers and penitence, they might then enter the enemy's country.

Soliman, having defeated the Franks, killed numbers of them in battle, and dragged into captivity many more, beset the remainder, who made an obstinate resistance in the place they defended. Finding, however, the next day, that Duke Bohemond, having wrested Macedonia from the emperor, was leading a large army of Normans and Apulians against the Turks[1] to avenge the effusion of Christian blood, he was so much alarmed that he broke up from Civitot, and withdrew his troops, in all haste, for the defence of his own territories. The impetuous Franks disdained to wait for the arrival of succour from Bohemond and the rest of the faithful, but trusting too confidently in their own valour pursued the Turks to their own borders, where, as I said before, they by God's permission, suffered a severe defeat.

CH. VI. *The Crusaders arrive in successive divisions under the walls of Constantinople—Alarm of the Greek emperor—He demands an oath of fealty from the Christian chiefs—They cross the Bosphorus, and march to Nice.*

DUKE GODFREY arrived at Constantinople before any of the other chiefs, and pitched his camp near it on the tenth of the calends of January [23rd December]. Meanwhile Bohemond advanced by slow marches, judiciously making his troops halt for rest every day as he waited for those who were left to follow in the rear. The emperor Alexius assigned the duke quarters in a suburb of the city, soon after his arrival,[2] and the duke's

[1] It was quite impossible that Soliman (Kilidge Arslan) could have stopped his pursuit of the Christian pilgrims in the month of October from apprehension of the advance of Bohemond, who did not cross the Adriatic till the month of December, nor arrive in the neighbourhood of Constantinople till the month of April in the following year.

[2] Quarters were assigned to Godfrey de Bouillon and his troops among the gardens on the shore of the Bosphorus.

squires purveyed all that was necessary for the army, passing to and fro in the neighbourhood of the city to procure fodder and whatever they wanted in thoughtless security, but the Turkopoles and Petscheneye,[1] laid wait for them, by the emperor's order, and many were daily cut off. No one suspected any treachery on his part, as he had voluntarily offered them hospitality; but the duke was in great distress at the loss of his people by the insidious attacks of the Turcopoles. In consequence, Baldwin marched out of the camp for the protection of his followers, and discovering the enemy who laid in wait for them, attacked them suddenly and overpowering them killed some, and carried off sixty whom he delivered as prisoners to his brother. When the emperor heard this, he was much incensed, and began to contrive mischief to the pilgrims, but the wary duke was on his guard against treachery, and withdrawing from the city pitched his tents on the same spot where they stood at first. Night coming on, his camp was attacked by the emperor's order and the army exposed to serious loss. But the prudent duke, expecting a surprise, had posted the sentries for the night round the camp with great care, giving them orders to be on the alert. The assailants therefore met an instant repulse; seven of them were killed, and the duke pursued the rest with great vigour to the city gates. Returning to his camp, he remained there five days, during which the emperor was employed in devising means for annoying the Christians, while the duke was anxiously consulting with his confederates. The emperor decided on prohibiting the passage of the duke's troops through the imperial city, the duke resolved to wait the arrival of reinforcements from the chiefs who were on their march. At length the crafty and politic emperor, who left no device untried, came to terms with the duke, assuring him, that if he would cross over the strait[2] he would find him abundant supplies of provisions, and would supply money for satisfying all who were in want of their pay; he took an oath also that the duke should have nothing to fear from him. The designing prince contrived

[1] The *Turcopoles* were light cavalry of Turkish race, or a mixed breed, in the pay of the Greek emperors. The *Petscheneyes* were other auxiliary troops of Sclavonian origin.

[2] The Bosphorus.

this, in order to remove the duke and his troops from Constantinople, that he might not have the advantage of the counsels and aid of the princes who were expected. In consequence, the duke crossed over; after having sworn to the emperor, and received from him the same pledge of fidelity to their mutual promises.

Advancing from Adrianople,[1] Bohemond halted his troops in a valley, and eloquently addressing them recommended them to act with prudence, and, remembering that their pilgrimage was undertaken in the cause of God, to restrain themselves from laying violent hands on the houses and property of the Christians; but, having God always before their eyes, the rich among them should help the poor, and the strong the weak, supporting them for the love of God, with their strength and their money. From this valley they marched to Castoria, where they kept our Lord's nativity with great solemnity. They halted there some days, but the inhabitants would have no dealings with them, as they greatly needed, regarding them not as pilgrims, but as cut-throats and oppressors. In consequence they were reduced to such want that they were compelled to carry off oxen, horses, or asses, and everything eatable they could lay hands on. Departing from Castoria,[2] they pitched their camp in Pelagonia,[3] and finding there a strong castle belonging to the heretics[4] which was well stored with all kinds of supplies,

[1] Bohemond arrived by sea near Adrianople, in Albania, in the month of December. Our author probably mistook this city for one of the same name in Thrace, much better known.

[2] *Castoria* is an episcopal city in Macedonia, near the source of the Cattaro. The place stands in the middle of a lake, and is only connected with the mainland by means of an isthmus, defended by a wall flanked with towers. It was occupied by Bohemond from 1081 to 1084, while he was engaged in war with Alexius, for his father, Robert Guiscard. It should seem that in 1096 he only encamped under the walls; and it may be easily conceived that the inhabitants, remembering the sufferings that they had undergone at his hands on the former occasion, did not give him a very hearty reception.

[3] *Pelagonia*, a province of Macedonia, so called from a city of the same name, which was destroyed when the Romans invaded the country. From the manner in which the troops of Bohemond conducted themselves, it would appear that his exhortations had made no great impression on their minds.

[4] The heretics were the Christians of the Greek church.

they assaulted it on all sides at once, and setting fire to it consumed the place and the inhabitants, leaving nothing but ruins. The pilgrims indeed held Jews, heretics, and Saracens in equal odium, calling them all the enemies of God. They then arrived on the bank of the river Vardari,[1] which Bohemond forded with part of his troops, but Count Rosinolo with the rest halted on the other side. The emperor's cavalry, who hovered in the rear of the expedition, no sooner saw the Christian army divided than they fell with great fury on Count Rosinolo and his division. Tancred however, who had not advanced far on the other side, perceiving the conflict, put spurs to his horse and forded again, or rather swimming across, the river flew like lightning to the rescue of the count. Two thousand troops quickly followed Tancred in re-crossing the river, and speedily putting the Turcopoles to rout drove them off and gained a glorious victory. Some fell in the skirmish, but many more were taken prisoners and carried bound before Bohemond. Being interrogated why they engaged in these hostilities, although he was at peace with their emperor, they replied: "We are in the emperor's pay, and do what he commands?" This battle, unprovoked by the Christians, was fought on Wednesday the first day of Lent.[2] Bohemond was extremely indignant at the emperor's perfidy, but he smothered his resentment, and dismissed his prisoners without punishment, though not without warning them by severe threats, not to molest his people again. "We are," he said to his confidential friends, "on the point of passing near the emperor's capital, and we had better restrain our anger, and strive as far as possible to give him no cause for being exasperated against us. It is an extreme folly for a man to be inflamed with passion, when there is no means of taking vengeance, while it is the part of self-possession to dissemble as long as no opportunity is afforded of obtaining satisfaction. A prudent man will postpone for a season what he cannot accomplish at once. He is doubly guilty, both of baseness and cowardice, who makes loud threats when he cannot strike, and who, when he can, passes over the insults he has received. If it is in our

[1] The Vardari, the principal river of Macedonia, runs into the gulf of Salonica, two leagues from that city.

[2] The 18th of February, 1097.

power let us excel the emperor in good behaviour, but if not let us magnanimously overlook the injuries he may do us." Such were his words; and then silently repressing any angry invectives, he forwarded a message to the emperor begging a safe conduct for the pilgrims of Jesus Christ.

In the year of our Lord 1097, the fifth indiction, Robert, duke of Normandy, Hugh the Great,[1] Stephen of Blois, and Robert the Fleming, with other men of rank, who had assembled from various countries, and spent the winter in Italy with their troops, joyfully took advantage of the favourable season of spring, and crossing the Adriatic joined their forces to those of Mark Bohemond in Macedonia.[2] At the sight of so great a body of nobles united for one object, and such incomparable valour sincerely devoted to the work of the Lord, there was great exultation among all present who were his faithful servants. The emperor Alexius had already felt the weight of the Cisalpine arms,[3] and he was therefore in no little alarm when he received intelligence of the approach of so many barons. Considering, however, by what contrivance he could elude the danger, he came to the determination of betraying them under the appearance of giving them a peaceable reception. This prince was wily, plausible in speech, liberal enough, and deeply skilled in the art of deceiving. He, therefore, sent envoys to the noble pilgrims, humbly begging that the peace might not be broken, offering them a free passage through his dominions, and promising on oath to supply them with all things necessary for their subsistence. Duke Bohemond, who had already sufficient experience of the emperor's craftiness, and had twice defeated him in battle, gave no credence to his

[1] As it has been already remarked, we must detach Hugh the Great from this group, which did not cross the Adriatic till the spring. Hugh the Great arrived at Constantinople as early as the month of November, a prisoner—William of Malmesbury says *in libera custodia*—however, he was not released until the arrival of Godfrey of Bouillon and the count of Flanders, who had gained the start of Bohemond.

[2] The duke of Normandy and the Count de Blois did not embark at Brundusium till Easter-day, April 5, 1097; and did not join Bohemond till the siege of Nice, where they arrived the first week in June. The bishop of Bayeux had expired at Palermo in the month of February, as we have already seen.

[3] At Joannina and Arta in 1083.

false promises, and strongly recommended his associates to lay siege to Constantinople, a measure which he showed to be most advantageous by the clearest arguments. The Franks however replied: "We have left our possessions, and have voluntarily embarked in this expedition, that, for the love of Christ, we may confound the Infidels and liberate the Christians. But the Greeks are Christians, and we are therefore for making peace with them, and even restoring to them what they have lost by the Turks. The sagacious Bohemond was therefore compelled by the counsels of the Franks to conclude a peace with the Greek emperor,[1] to the great injury, as it turned out, of the Christian cause. On being called upon, the emperor assumed the appearance of acting with great favour towards the chiefs, and sent his master of the palace,[2] who was in his entire confidence, with other envoys, to Bohemond, to conduct him safely through the country, and to provide him everywhere with the supplies he might need. In short, the Crusaders marching forward pitched their camp from place to place as circumstances required, and, passing by the city of Serra,[3] arrived at Rusa.[4] Having obtained from the Greeks, while there, all that they wanted in sufficient abundance, the pilgrims pitched their tents on Wednesday before Easter.[5] Bohemond, now leaving his troops, hastened forward with a small retinue to have an audience with the emperor. Meanwhile, Tancred

[1] It was not in a personal conference, but by his envoys, while Godfrey was treating with Alexius, that Bohemond urged him to break off the negociation, and attempt the conquest of Constantinople. It is not, therefore, quite correct to state that Bohemond was compelled by the other chiefs to come to terms with Alexius, but only that he failed of preventing their treating with the Greek emperor.

[2] For *Corpalatium*, read *Curopalatium*. They were in the number of the principal officers of the court of Constantinople, where they filled nearly the same functions as those of the Pretorian prefects of the Roman emperors. It was not only this dignitary, but the chiefs of the Crusaders, who had already arrived at Constantinople, and Godfrey de Bouillon himself, who were sent by Alexius to Bohemond, to induce him to come himself to that capital before his troops.

[3] *Seres*, an archiepiscopal city of Macedonia, between Salonica, Philippi, and Amphipolis.

[4] Now *Rouskoinan*, near the mouth of the Hebrus. Villehardouin calls this city Rouse.

[5] The 1st of April, 1097.

led the Christians, who were much exhausted by their journey, another way through a rich valley, where they obtained refreshments for their wearied bodies, and celebrated the feast of Easter. Alexius, learning the arrival of Bohemond, the great object of his alarm, as he had twice triumphed over him, gave him an honourable reception, and made abundant provision for his entertainment outside the city in a manner becoming to both parties.[1]

In the interim, Duke Godfrey, leaving his comrades on the other side of the straits, had returned to Constantinople, in consequence of the emperor's having neglected to furnish them with the supplies he had promised. The bishop of Puy and the count of Tholouse, having left behind them the mob they led, were also at Constantinople. The emperor, following the advice of the Greeks, who were in great alarm lest the Franks should make a combined movement and pillage their property, communicated with these great lords separately, requiring each of them to pay him homage and fealty. He promised, if they consented to this, to give them pay and supplies, and marching in person for their support to assist them with his whole forces. The Franks now found themselves in a very difficult position; they were unwilling to take the oath of fealty, and yet without it the Greeks would not grant them a free passage. They had no desire to war with a Christian people, but they were not permitted to march through their country peaceably. On the other hand, they shrank from retracing their steps and returning home without effecting their object. At length, driven by necessity, they guaranteed to the emperor Alexius his life and crown, swearing to make no attempt on either so long as he kept faith with them. The count of Tholouse resisted longer than the rest, and even anxiously sought how he might be avenged of the emperor. However the general opinion of the chiefs prevailed, though it was not without difficulty they diverted the angry count from his purpose. He, therefore, submitted to the oath, but he was never induced to do

[1] We are informed by a contemporary writer, that the emperor granted to Bohemond a territory in Romania, fifteen days' journey long by eight broad; probably as a position for his encampment.

homage.[1] Orders were now given for embarking the army. Tancred had arrived in the interim with the troops he commanded, but hearing that Alexius had exacted an oath of fealty from the chiefs, he mingled among the common soldiers with Richard de Principatu, and having immediately set sail, passed the straits in great haste. Bohemond and the count of Tholouse remained until the emperor gave them satisfaction about the supplies. Duke Godfrey and others went to Nicomedia, and remained three days with Tancred. Then the duke, finding that there was no road over which it would be possible that so vast and mighty a multitude could travel, sent forward three thousand men to remove rocks and level the approaches to the mountains. These pioneers, armed with hatchets, axes, mattocks, and tools of all sorts for clearing away the bushes and underwood, and levelling the precipitous mountain passes, levelled a road for the main body, and fixing signals on the heights to prevent those who followed from losing their way, arrived at Nice in Bithynia.

CH. VII. *The siege of Nice—After a long defence, the citizens give it up to the Greek emperor—Discontents of the Crusaders.*

THE camp was marked out on the day before the nones [6th] of May, and the tents of the forces of the West being pitched, siege was laid to Nice, the capital of Bithynia, a city so strongly fortified by lofty walls and a lake[2] which washes them on one side, as to appear impregnable. At first there was so great a scarcity of bread in the camp until the emperor's supplies arrived, that if a loaf could be found, it was worth twenty or thirty pence. But God providing for his people, Bohemond soon made his appearance with a great convoy, both by sea and land. The scarcity was therefore converted into great plenty throughout the Christian army. The attack on the city was commenced on

[1] All that could be wrung from the count was a promise on oath to engage in no enterprise against the emperor's life or the integrity of his states, which was far short of the oath of fealty; and even this was yielded upon the implied condition of the sworn promise simultaneously given by Alexius to join the crusade in person.

[2] The lake Ascanius.

Ascension Day,[1] by erecting great engines of war to the height of the fortifications. This assault continued for two days, employed in endeavouring to batter down the walls. Meanwhile, the Gentiles within the place resisted the attack with great resolution, manfully defending their dwellings and households by hurling stones and darts on the assailants, while, protecting themselves with their shields, they boldly exposed themselves to the shower of missiles which were launched against them. The Franks, on their side, left nothing untried; covering themselves with their shields closely wedged, like the shell of a tortoise, from which the enemy's iron hailstorm glanced off, they wearied the besieged with incessant assaults. Meanwhile, the citizens sent messengers imploring succour from their neighbours and countrymen: "Hasten," they said, "to our aid! You can enter without apprehension at the south gate, which is not yet blockaded." But, by God's help, their hopes were frustrated; for the same day, the Saturday after the Ascension, the bishop of Puy and the count of Tholouse arrived in the camp, and the guard of the south gate was entrusted to them by the other chiefs. The count, therefore, fell suddenly on the Saracens as they advanced in blind security, and his whole force, in bright array, repelled the undisciplined horde of barbarians. The Saracens were routed with disgrace, having lost many of their people, and the Franks gained an easy victory. Again the citizens of Nice summoned their allies, assuring them on oath of the certainty of their being successful; and they came boldly, furnished with ropes to bind the Christians they expected to make captives. But the Franks encountered the attack of the Gentiles in a close column, and then charging them, routed and defeated them a second time with great slaughter, and returned in triumph to their camp. After this, Count Raymond and Bishop Aimar, with their troops, made great exertions, and assaulted the place in various ways, while, on their side, the besieged citizens obstinately resisted all their attacks.

At length, the Christian chiefs held a meeting, and determined and agreed on a plan for carrying on the siege of Nice. On one side the attack was entrusted to Bohemond and Tancred, near whom was posted Duke Godfrey and his

[1] The 7th of May.

brothers.[1] Next was Robert, count of Flanders, a brave soldier and most daring knight.[2] Near him were stationed Robert, duke of Normandy, Stephen, count of Chartres, Hugh, count of St. Pol, Conan the Breton, son of Count Geoffrey,[3] Ralph de Guader,[4] and Roger de Barneville,[5] with their respective followers. The count of Tholouse and the bishop of Puy kept guard at the south gate. The place was now so blockaded that there was no ingress or egress except by the lake which washed the walls on one side. This was securely navigated by the Gentiles in full view of the Christians, and supplies were thus constantly introduced into the place. However, the Christian army had laudably formed the siege of Nice, and had skilfully disposed against it their well-formed camps and stately tents in the name of Christ. Splendid as was their array in arms, they were still more distinguished by the lustre of their virtues. They went forth to battle pure in their conduct, strong in limb, and stout in heart. Carefully watching for the good of their souls, they refrained from all fleshly lusts and forbidden indulgences. The chiefs fought in the ranks; and, while they commanded and encouraged others, mounted guard like common sentinels. All things were had in common. The

[1] Bohemond and Tancred were stationed near the north gate of the city; the duke of Normandy and count of Flanders at the west.

[2] His father, Robert the Frisian, had formed a friendly alliance with Alexius on his return from the Holy Land, by way of Constantinople, in 1088, and after that had been solicited to come to the aid of the Greek empire. His son, therefore, the present duke, was treated as an ally, and conducted himself as such in passing through the same provinces, and following the track in which Bohemond had preceded him; arriving under the walls of Constantinople after that prince, and before the count of Tholouse.

[3] Conan, second son of Godfrey, surnamed Botterel, count of Lamballe. He was killed at the battle of the Iron Bridge, where his grave was to be seen long afterwards, covered with a tombstone surmounted by a cross. Our author has omitted to mention a much more eminent person, Allan Fergan, duke of Brittany, and brother-in-law of Robert Curthose, who also was present in this Crusade.

[4] Ralph de Guader has been particularly noticed just before. See p. 80.

[5] Roger de Barneville-sur-Mer. See on the subject of this castle and family, *Les Anciens Châteaux de la Manche*, in the *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, t. 1, p. 259.—Our author omits to mention among the Crusaders who arrived with the duke of Normandy, the counts of Aumale and Boulogne.

bishops preached daily against incontinence, and whoredom and debauchery were scouted out of the camp.

Meanwhile, the Turks laboured hard in defence of their city, and freely went to and fro on the lake in sight of the Christians. The Franks were much disturbed at this, and consulted how they might deprive the Turks of the command of the lake. In consequence they sent envoys to Constantinople, and proposed to the emperor with great ability what they had planned against the enemy. The emperor on hearing their proposition gave it his immediate approval, and ordered that everything should be done as they requested. By his command a number of oxen were hastily collected, and swift vessels sailed for the port of Civitot. The Turcopoles were also ordered to be in readiness. The boats being then placed on waggons, and drawn by the oxen, with vast toil, to the shore of the lake, were, during the night, launched into the water, and manned by the Turcopoles. At the first dawn of day, they were discovered advancing in order towards the city. The citizens were astonished at seeing from their battlements the lake covered with boats, and began to think that perhaps succour was at hand from that quarter. But when the truth appeared, they were struck with consternation, and sunk into utter despair. There was no hope of safety now that the city was beset both by land and water. They therefore despatched messengers to the emperor, earnestly beseeching him to spare them in their low estate, and, by taking possession of the city which they were ready to surrender to him, save them from the enemy, so that they might not be exposed to pillage by foreigners. On receiving this message, the emperor being secretly jealous of the success of the Christians (as the event proved), yielded to the entreaties of the besieged, and gave orders to Tatan[1] his general, who had been despatched after the Crusaders

[1] This officer was not called Tatan, but Tatius. He was the son of a Saracen, taken prisoner by John Comnenus, and brought up as a slave, but obtained his freedom by his bravery and became the chief of the officers of the imperial household. The Latin historians of the Crusades, who have represented him in the most odious colours, draw his portrait personally as well as physically deformed. "His nostrils were slit; a sign of his perverted mind:" says William of Tyre. "His nose was cut off, for some reason or other, and was supplied by one of gold," adds Guibert, abbot of Nogent.

with forty thousand troops, as well as to his other officers, to bring to Byzantium in safety those citizens of Nice who were ready to surrender themselves and their property, and to be careful that no injury was done to the city. All was done as the emperor commanded, the city was given up to him, and the Gentile people were conducted uninjured to the imperial city. The emperor treated the vanquished with great generosity, giving them their liberty, and making the poor Christians liberal presents. The city being thus surrendered, the Crusaders drew off their forces. Numbers perished there by famine and the sword, or other means, who we believe attained the glory of martyrdom, as they offered their lives on behalf of their persecuted brethren. Many of the Gentiles also fell in various ways, whose bodies lay buried on all sides. The Crusaders were detained before the place seven months and three days,[1] and after the city was given up to the emperor turned their steps sorrowfully another road. In truth they sorely repented having wasted so much time on the siege, without having reduced the city to submit to their power as a place taken by assault. If the enemy's property had fallen into their hands, the necessities of the indigent would have been alleviated, and some portion of the expense they had incurred would have been repaid. The Crusaders did not patiently bear the order of Alexius[2] that they should not take

[1] The historians of the Crusades vary considerably in their accounts of the duration of the siege of Nice. From those of the best informed it may be concluded that it lasted thirty-five days, May 16 to June 20. Peter Tudebode speaks of seven weeks. Our author, who assigns it a much longer continuance (52 days), has been guilty of two serious omissions, that of the attack of Kilidge Arslan, to force the Crusaders to raise the siege; and that of the singular intrepidity of a Norman knight, whose name is unhappily lost. Having crossed the ditch under a shower of missiles, he attempted to make a breach in the wall, but, not being supported by his comrades, he was buried under the stones and timber heaped on him by the besieged.

[2] All the historians of the Holy War echo the complaints made by the Crusaders of the capitulation which deprived them of the plunder of Nice. Our brother editor of Ordericus, with some truth and laudable humanity, is indisposed to justify their indignation, on the ground, that the emperor had entitled himself by his munificence to the Crusaders (carried so far as even to take them into his regular pay), to receive from them an important city, only lately detached from his dominions, in a better condition than a heap of ruins. Then, on the score of humanity, as well as policy, the emperor's interference was justified by the fierce character of the Crusaders,

the spoils of Nice where they had wasted their resources and shed their blood to no purpose, and indeed had vastly diminished the means they possessed at the beginning of the siege. They had now become sensible, much to their loss, of the emperor's treacherous policy, but as there was at present no redress, they smothered their resentment. But the seeds of hatred were now sown, a hostile spirit was henceforth nourished, causes of discord burst forth, the phantoms of resentment grew portentous, and as Alexius had not acted justly towards the Crusaders, they meditated vengeance on him.

CH. VIII. *The crusaders advance from Nice—Become separated into two divisions—The hard-fought battle of Dorylæum—Continue their march by Iconium, Heraclea, and Tarsus—Cross the defiles of Mount Taurus—Engagement at the Iron-bridge, near Antioch.*

THE day on which the siege of Nice was raised,[1] the Christian army marched as far as a certain bridge, where they pitched their tents.[2] They remained encamped there two days, and on the third day resumed their march in great haste before day-light; but as the night was dark, they found themselves on an unknown road, uncertain if they

and their cruel treatment of places which subsequently fell into their hands. For ourselves, we confess, with all respect for the feeling which dictated these sentiments, we do not see what end was answered by the sacrifice of so much time, so many valuable lives, and so much treasure, in the siege of Nice, if the emperor was to reap the fruits of the enterprise; nor why, if it was necessary in a military point of view to dislodge the Turks in order that this strong fortress might be the base of future operations, it ought not to have been made the seat of a principality, vested in one of the Christian chiefs, like Antioch and Edessa, instead of being entrusted to so perfidious an ally as the Greek emperor. As to the question of humanity, it is sufficient to remark that, even in the present civilized age, the usages of war entirely justify the sack of fortified towns taken by assault, after holding out to the last extremity.

On the siege and capitulation of Nice, see a letter of Stephen de Blois to the Countess Adèle, his wife, in Mabillon's *Museum Italicum*, t. 1, p. 237.

[1] The Crusaders did not break up their camp till June 25, some days after the capitulation.

[2] This bridge is situated at the distance of six hours' march from Nice, at the confluence of the Gallus and Sungarius, now called by the Turks Sakaria.

were in the right way. In this dilemma the troops separated from each other into two bodies, and they spent two days in their march. In one division, there were Bohemond, Robert the Norman, Stephen, count of Blois, Tancred, Hugh de St. Pol, Gerard de Gournai, Walter de St. Valleri and Bernard his son,[1] William, son of Ranulf the viscount,[2] William de Ferrers,[3] Hervé, son of Dodemon,[4] Conan, son of Count Geoffrey, Ralph de Guader and his son Alan, Riou de Loheac,[5] Alan, steward of Dol,[6] and several more. In the other division were the count of Tholouse and the bishop of Puy, Duke Godfrey, Baldwin, Hugh the Great, and Robert the Fleming, with large bodies of their followers.

The same week, the Turks assembled to attack Bohemond[7] in numbers like the sand on the sea-shore, and trusting in their vast superiority of numbers, charged the Christians with spirit. They had Doliman[8] for their chief, and they were inflamed with rage against the foreigners who had dared to take Nice and ravage their territories. In their ranks were to be seen Turks and Saracens, Persians and Agulans,[9] to the number, as was computed, of three

[1] On these two persons, who were the grandson and great-grandson of Richard II., duke of Normandy, see vol. ii. p. 966.

[2] William, son of Ranulf de Briquessart, at that time viscount of Bayeux, and afterwards earl of Chester.

[3] William, baron of Ferrières St. Hilaire, near Bernai, who had already distinguished himself at the siege of Courci.

[4] The Breton chronicles mention, instead of Hervé, son of Dodemon, Hervé, son of Guyomark, count de Leon. The name of Dodemon still subsists in Normandy, but it is written Dondemont, which reminds us of the Dandy Dindemont of border Scotch story.

[5] Riou de Loheac, third son of Judicael de Loheac, died in the Crusade.

[6] Probably the steward of the archbishop of Dol.

[7] On the 1st of July, at Dorylæum, in the valley of Gorgoni. It appears thot this was one of the first battles in which the Crusaders heard the sound of the Turkish drums, which much frightened both the troops and their horses. "Their horses became unsteady under the strange shouts of the Saracens, and the braying of their trumpets, and the beating of their tambours, and refused to obey the spear. Our men, also, amidst this compound din, hardly knew what it meant."— Henry of Huntingdon's History (following William of Tyre), p. 229. *Bohn's Antiq. Library.*

The Christian army lost in this battle William, Tancred's brother, and Geoffrey de Monte-Scaglioso.

[8] Soliman (Kilidge Arslan).

[9] It is not known whether this appellation is given to a nation, a sect, or

hundred and sixty thousand men, besides Arabs, whose swarms were countless. The illustrious Bohemond seeing the innumerable hosts of the enemy threatening and insulting his followers with cries of rage, and brandishing their spears, stood firm and unappalled, while he gave some short and skilful directions to his troops and cheered them on to the glorious conflict. He also despatched swift messengers to his confederates who were parted from him at some little distance, urging them to hasten with all speed to his succour. He commanded the foot soldiers to pitch their tents with rapidity and judgment, and the cavalry to follow him and, encountering the pagans, to stand, and maintain the conflict with unabated vigour. Meanwhile the Turks rushed on with horrid cries,[1] and attacked the Christians with great resolution, shooting their arrows, throwing their darts, and some of them engaging in close fight. There was no respite for the harassed crusaders, even when their bodies were reeking with blood and sweat. But the Franks stood the brunt of the attack without recoiling; sometimes prudently avoiding the assaults of their enemies, sometimes meeting them sword-in-hand, expecting the arrival of the other division, and never yielding a foot of ground. They sustained this fierce struggle from the third hour of the day to the ninth. The women rendered essential service to the combatants by running to them with pitchers of water when they were dying of thirst, and giving them encouraging words, the field of battle being the burning desert. The conflict was maintained on both sides with the utmost desperation, and the crusaders were much distressed; even their camp was assaulted several times.[2]

a particular corps of troops. The historian Balderic, however, tells us that the Angulans were covered all over with steel armour (like the Estradiots of the fifteenth century), impenetrable to arrows and spears, and that they fought sword-in-hand.

[1] "*Atque dicentes nescio quid diabolicum in barbarâ linguâ*," naïvely observes Peter Tudebode.

[2] Our author's account does not give a very exact idea of the movements in the battle of Dorylæum. He omits mentioning the attack and capture by the Turks of the Crusaders' camp, the brilliant valour of the duke of Normandy, and its recapture by Bohemond, who commanded the reserve. It was not till after their deliverance by this turn of affairs that the women carried refreshments to the combatants.

Meanwhile, the other division of the army discredited the account given by Bohemond's messengers, questioning the reality of the attack: for they thought that there was no nation which would venture to engage with even a tenth part of their force. When, however, the intelligence was spread among the troops, and one messenger followed another with news of the battle,[1] Duke Godfrey, a knight always the first in action, and Count Stephen, who was remarkable for his prudence and caution, together with Hugh the Great, and Baldwin and Stephen, all men of great intrepidity, galloped forward with their respective retainers. The bishop of Puy, and Raymond, count of Tholouse, marched in the rear. The crusaders, already engaged, and who were now exhausted with fatigue, wondered how such countless hordes could have fallen upon them so suddenly and unexpectedly, and whence they came; for the dense mass covered the hills and valleys, and where there was any level ground it was swept by their squadrons of cavalry. Still, by God's help, the Christians fought stoutly, and the affair came to mortal combat at close quarters, sword-in-hand. But now their comrades who had been called to the rescue suddenly made their appearance. The bishop of Puy, with the large body of troops under his command, threatened the enemy's rear; on one side the count of St. Giles, Baldwin and Eustace, galloped forward at full speed. Duke Godfrey charged the right flank, having with him Hugh the Great, and Robert the Fleming, a soldier always prompt in action; while Robert the Norman, Stephen Count de Blois, Tancred, and Bohemond, still held the ground on which they had long borne the brunt of the conflict. The Gentiles, finding themselves now unexpectedly attacked in the rear as well as in the front, were thrown into confusion and took to flight without offering any further resistance. The swords of the Christians swept their ranks, and multitudes perished by death in every shape. Those who were able escaped to their fortresses. Thousands of the barbarians fell, after fiercely combating the crusaders and maintaining an obstinate conflict the whole of the day.

[1] Arnold de Rouex, chaplain to the duke of Normandy, conveyed the intelligence of the enemy's attack and the demand for succour, to Godfrey de Bouillon.

William the Marquis, Tancred's brother, and Geoffrey de Monte-Scaglioso, knights of distinguished bravery, and of high rank and great merit, together with many others, both horse and foot, fell in the battle. The Turks are as dexterous in their mode of fighting as they are daring, wielding their scimitars so that there is no parrying the blow, while at other times they shower death on their enemies from a distance with their arrows and other missiles. They boast their descent from a common stock with the Franks, and have traditions that their ancestors were once Christians. They also say that no people are instinctively warriors but themselves and the Franks.

The battle was fought on the calends [the 1st] of July, and a day was set apart for offering with solemn service thanksgivings to Almighty God, who ordereth all things well.

The infidels having been thus defeated and put to flight, the Christians returned to spoil the enemy's camp, in which they found large quantities of silver and gold. They collected a great number of beasts of burden, mules, horses, oxen, camels, sheep, and asses, and stripped the tents of their various furniture, returning to their own camp laden with booty in triumph and inexpressible joy. The report of this great victory spreading among strange and distant nations deterred them from hostilities against the Christians, whose glory was thus published in the ears of remote people. All were struck with terror at their achievements, and were in alarm lest they should be attacked in return.

On his flight from Nice, Soliman fell in with a tribe of ten thousand Arabs, to whom he described in glowing colours the excessive bravery, the indomitable resolution and the vast numbers and rich equipments of the Crusaders; by which account he prevailed with them to join him in his flight. Meanwhile, as human ingenuity has many contrivances, and occupies itself with what may appear frivolous, the Turks invented a new story to amuse the simple Christians who lived among them. For Soliman and the other Gentiles, when they came to towns and places inhabited by the Syrian Christians, cunningly said to them: "We have beaten the Franks; they have all perished, or if any are left, they are burrowing in the earth." Addressing

the ignorant natives in this way, they got admission into their towns, and pillaged their dwellings and churches, carrying off whatever valuables they possessed, as well as their sons and daughters. Preceding the march of the Franks, they carried on this deception, until it came to the ears of the Crusaders, and they hastened to pursue them.[1] They now entered on an arid and uninhabitable region, in which they were reduced to the last extremity by hunger and thirst. If they chanced to light upon a spot where corn had been sown, but was yet unripe, they plucked the ears, and rubbing them out, chewed and swallowed the glutinous paste.[2] They lost a number of men in this desert, and many of their beasts of burden. Famous knights were compelled to march on foot, while those who had the means procured oxen to carry themselves and their effects instead of carriages. Not long afterwards they reached a fertile district, abounding in food and all good things, except that it did not afford a fresh supply of horses. Arriving at Iconium,[3] they filled their skins with water by the advice of the natives, and after a day's march reached the banks of a river where they halted two days to refresh themselves. The light troops, who were always in advance, to provide fodder and other necessaries for the army by pillage, arrived before the main body at the city of Heraclea, where a considerable number of Turkish troops were collected in the hope of opposing the crusaders. Some of them lay in ambush to cut off the advanced guards, but the Franks boldly charged them and dispersed them without difficulty. The Turks

[1] The Christian army resumed its march on the 5th of July, over the plain of Dorylæum.

[2] Our author omits some details which are characteristic of the sufferings from the want of water in traversing the desert so truly called by the ancients, Phrygia the burnt. Women were taken in childbirth before their time; others, in their despair, rolled themselves naked on the sands; the falcons and hawks, which the nobles had brought with them to Asia, died of thirst on their masters' wrists, and the greyhounds at their feet.

[3] Iconium, the metropolis of Lycaonia, now called Koniah.

Our author passes over several important occurrences in the interval, and, among others, the illness of Godfrey in consequence of his struggle with a gigantic bear, and that of the count of Tholouse, which was so severe that he was lifted from his bed and laid on the ground, when his pulse was scarcely perceptible, and the office for the dead said over him, says the author of the History of the Holy War, who was himself present.

being driven out of Heraclea,[1] the place soon fell into the hands of the Christians, and they spent four days in it. Tancred and Baldwin now took a different route from the rest, and entered the valley of Bolentrot[2] with their own followers; and Tancred then separating from Baldwin also marched to Tarsus with the troops he commanded. As they approached the city, the Turks sallied forth prepared to oppose them; but Tancred, with his usual intrepidity, immediately attacked them with great spirit, and drove them back in confusion to the city, to which he laid siege. During the night following, however, the Turks made their escape, and in the dead of the night the citizens cried aloud: "Ye Franks, conquerors, and rulers of the world, the Turks have withdrawn; the city is open to you; enter the gates; hasten, ye invincible Franks, to take possession of the place; come quickly; linger not; why do ye tarry?" All this was distinctly heard by the sentinels in the camp; but as it was night, the consideration of the affair was deferred till the morning. However, at dawn of day, the elders of the city came to the camp, and surrendering themselves and their property, chose Tancred for their prince. This gave rise to a serious dispute between the Christian chiefs, Baldwin, who commanded the largest part of the troops, contending for giving up the place to plunder, or at least for requiring one half of all it contained. On the other hand, Tancred, whose character was moderate, preferred abandoning the conquest of the city to pillaging the citizens who had so readily committed themselves to his care. He, therefore, gave the signal for the march, and at the sound of the trumpets drew off his forces, somewhat annoyed, and Baldwin alone occupied Tarsus.[3] Before long, two wealthy cities, Azera[4] and

[1] Heraclea; thirty hours' march from Iconium.

[2] This valley lies at the entrance of one of the passes of Mount Taurus. Its present name *Gealek-Bogaz;* Albert d'Aix calls this pass "The Gate of Judas."

[3] This statement is not perfectly correct. The Turks did not privately evacuate Tarsus, but they hoisted the flag of the Christians, promising to surrender if they were not relieved. Baldwin finished driving them from the towers which they still held, when he replaced Tancred in the interior of the place.

It appears that Godfrey now separated his division from the rest of the army, and having occupied Edessa, extended his conquests in Armenia and Mesopotamia, founding the first principality of the Franks in Asia.

[4] It should be *Adana*: a city eight leagues from Tarsus. Tancred,

Malmistra,[1] and several walled towns surrendered to Tancred. Meanwhile, the rest of the chiefs advanced into the country of the Armenians with the troops they commanded. On their approach the town of Alfia[2] was given up to them, and was entrusted to a military man named Simeon, a native of the country,[3] for the defence of the neighbourhood.

The main body of the Crusaders arrived before Cæsarea in Cappadocia,[4] which they razed to the ground. The ruins still left attest the former importance of the place.

Plastencia,[5] a fine city, standing in a fertile country, which had lately been besieged by the Turks, for three weeks without being able to reduce it, opened its gates readily to the Crusaders. Peter de Alfia[6] requested to have the custody of it, and the chiefs committed it to him without hesitation for the defence of the country, to be held under fealty to the holy sepulchre and the Christian religion. Bohemond, who was always most active in military enterprises, selecting a chosen body of his own followers, went in pursuit of the Turks who had besieged Plastencia, and kept in advance of

finding it already in the occupation of a Burgundian knight named Guelph, passed on after having rested and provisioned his troops.

[1] *Malmistra*, the ancient Mopsuestia, now called Mesissé, six hours S.E. of Adana, and three leagues from the sea on the river Djihan, the ancient Pyramus. This place is composed of two castles, one of which is called Cufr-Bina—the work of the infidels, probably because it is believed to have been built by the Crusaders.

[2] Archbishop Baudri, also, names this place *Alfia*. Messieurs Michaud and Poujoulat were not able to discover any trace of it in their travels in Syria. Matthew Paris, who calls it Azena, pretends that it was the duke of Normandy who took it, and gave it to this Simeon, one of his knights. The author of the History of the Holy War, who was an eye-witness, tells us, on the contrary, that Simeon was a native of the country: *ortus regione*.

[3] The Lesser Armenia.

[4] All the historians of the Crusades have committed the same error in placing the site of the ancient Cæsarea of Cappadocia between Heraclea and Cosor, now called *Kaisarieh*; but it was situated far from thence in the northern part of Asia Minor.

[5] We have no account of the situation of this place by the modern historians of the Crusades.

[6] This person is called by Robert de St. Remi, *Petrus ab Alpibus*, and by Peter Tudebode, *Petrus de Alaph*. Perhaps he was the Peter d'Aulps, a Provençal gentleman, who after having accompanied Robert Guiscard to Cephalonia in 1085, enlisted in the Greek army, and founded at Constantinople the powerful family of the Petraliphes.

the army in order to molest them, but to no purpose, as with all his diligence he was unable to find them.

The Crusaders now arrived at Coxon,[1] a stately and rich city, which the inhabitants voluntarily ceded to their brother Christians. The army halted there three days to refresh themselves after their fatigues. It was now reported to the count of Tholouse that the Turks who were in possession of Antioch, had deserted it, and fled. Consulting, therefore, his associates, he selected some officers who, being sent forward, should carefully explore the road, and obtain all necessary information. The viscount of Châtillon,[2] William de Montpelier,[3] Peter de Roas,[4] and Peter Raimond,[5] chosen for this service, advanced with a large body of troops into the valley of Antioch; but they found affairs very different from what they expected. The Turks were making great preparations for the defence of the city.

Peter de Roas, being detached from the rest of the force, penetrated into the valley of Rugia,[6] where he discovered a number of Turks whom he cut to pieces or defeated and put to flight. The Armenians, who had heard of the successes of the Crusaders and the frequent disasters of the infidels, gave up the city of Rugia to Peter, with several walled towns. The main army found the road they had to pass extremely difficult. They had to climb the passes of the mountains[7]

[1] Cosor, or Cocson, the ancient Cucusus, celebrated for being the place to which St. Chrysostom was banished in the year 404.

[2] Peter, viscount of Châtillon.

[3] William, son of Ermengard, lord of Montpellier, 1085—1121. He distinguished himself at the siege of Marrah, where he commanded the moveable towers of wood, by means of which the place was entered. His son, whose will is preserved in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, was also in the Holy Land.

[4] Probably Peter de Roaix, near Vaucluse.

[5] Peter Raimond d'Hautpool.

There is another person mentioned by Peter Tudebode, whom he calls *Aralium Vicecomitem*, and who sent to the count of Tholouse *plenans hastam*, "with Turkish noses and lips."

[6] According to M. Poujoulat, the site of the town and castle of Rugia is now occupied by the village of Riha, the third resting place in the journey from Lattakia to Aleppo.

[7] The Crusaders had to cross the chain of Mount Taurus by almost impracticable passes, which they cursed in their sufferings, and called the Devil's Mountains. Peter of Tudebode is at a loss for words sufficiently to execrate them. He describes the knights as clasping their hands in

which were precipitous and rocky, and where they sustained severe losses. The troops often fell and were bruised, while struggling and faint from the difficulties of the track; and the horses rolled over a fearful precipice. Many were reduced to penury by the loss of their horses and the beasts of burden which carried their effects. Having escaped with difficulty from these dangerous passes, they reached a place called Marafi,[1] the inhabitants of which furnished them with plentiful supplies of food. They rested a short time there, until they were somewhat recruited.[2] After this the army entered the noble, rich, and extensive valley in which stands the royal and famous city of Antioch, the metropolis and capital of Syria, in which Peter, prince of the apostles, had his episcopal seat. Now, however, by the mysterious providence of God, several of the churches in that city are ruined, and irreverently applied to secular uses.[3] The light troops

despair, and selling their armour for whatever it would fetch, to be relieved of the burden; and even sometimes throwing it away from the impossibility of transporting it over such precipices.

[1] *Maresia*, now *Marash;* eight or ten leagues from Cosor, across the mountains. Godechilde de Toëni, daughter of Ralph de Toëni, and wife of Raymond de Boulogne, died and was buried at Maresia. It stands on the site of the ancient Germanica. The Crusaders were obliged to halt there to wait for Bohemond, who, in spite of all that our author says of his activity, had fallen into the rear of the rest of the army.

[2] Our author has omitted to mention the occupation by the Crusaders of Artesium, the ancient Chalcis, situated between Maresia and Antioch, which surrendered to Robert of Flanders. A village near this town and castle still bears the name of *Ertesi*. According to Matthew of Paris, the duke of Normandy assisted in its capture.

[3] William of Tyre furnishes some curious details of the outrages perpetrated by the Moslems, iconoclasts on principle, on the images of the saints painted on the walls of the churches of Antioch. "The venerable pictures of the saints, which the simple and devout people in their want of cultivation, laudably use instead of books, and which, in place of lessons, inspire them with devotion, were razed from the walls, and the infidels plucked out their eyes, and cut off their noses, and daubed them with filth from the foulest places, as if they were venting their rage against living persons."—Will. Tyr. *Hist.* lib. vi. We have other details, not less curious, of the transformation of the church of St. Peter into three mosques: "The Turks occupied, or rather polluted, the church of St. Peter, converting it into three chapels for the devil's worship, and covered with lime or plaster the paintings, which were richly ornamented with silver and gold, so as to be splendid objects from every part of the church. They also inscribed diabolical sentences on the face of every picture."—*Belli Sacri Hist.* lx.

in advance having reached the Iron Bridge[1] found large bodies of Turks who were hastening to defend the city. They immediately attacked them, for the Christians were always under arms, and their onset was so sudden that they were easily routed.[2] Many were slain, and the purveyors brought back to their camp which was pitched on the river bank, the convoy of mules and beasts of burden which was being conducted to the city laden with provisions and all kinds of valuable supplies. Great joy spread through the camp, both for the victory, and the rich booty the purveyors had brought back with them. Daily praises and thanksgivings were constantly offered to God, for the especial protection he afforded to those who had become exiles from their native land, in love for Him, in the midst of heathen armies.

Bohemond, who never yielded to idleness and sloth, for he was always in action, cautiously reconnoitred the gate of Antioch at the head of four thousand troops, and kept watch, under cover, to prevent any parties from entering or leaving the city unobserved.

CH. IX. *The siege of Antioch—Assaults of the enemy—Operations of the besiegers—Forts built by the crusaders—their sufferings—The city taken by escalade and sacked.*

AT the first dawn of day, the army struck their tents and marched from the spot where they had encamped. It was on Wednesday the twelfth of the calends of November [the 21st of October],[3] that they pitched their camp before the city, and they blockaded it strictly until the third of the nones [the 3rd] of June, on the side of three of the gates The other quarter of the city[4] was not invested, because it was closed in by such projecting and inaccessible cliffs and

[1] This bridge of nine arches over the Orontes, not over the Pharpar, is situated four leagues from Antioch. M. Michaud informs us that it was laid in ruins in 1822, by an earthquake, together with the two towers, the doors of which were covered with iron plates, from whence the bridge derived its name. William of Tyre, however, finds another reason for its being so called, in the Orontes, near Antioch, having the name of the *Fer*.

[2] The duke of Normandy commanded the van in this battle. The standards of the Christian army were entrusted to Roger de Barneville and Everard du Puiset.

[3] According to William of Tyre, it was the 18th.

[4] The south side.

mountains, that there was no level space on which the besiegers could establish themselves. The consternation into which the inhabitants of Antioch and their neighbours were thrown was such that no one dared to encounter the purveyors[1] for the Christian army; all was quiet therefore for nearly fifteen days. The country about Antioch, being a fertile valley, is very productive, being full of vineyards, abounding with corn and fruit, and shady groves, and pleasant gardens, and rich meadows. A number of Armenian and Syrian Christians who were at the beck of the Turks, pretending to make their escape from the place, went boldly to the camp, as mendicants, and having remarked what was passing returned and reported it to the Turks, to the great injury of the Crusaders.[2] For the garrison of Antioch having thus learnt the plans of their enemies, began to grow bold, straitening the pilgrims by attacks, cutting off those who were not on their guard, and molesting them by robberies and other means. They beset all the roads in the neighbourhood, and shut out the Christians from receiving any supplies by sea or over the mountains; so that those who were encamped without the place were blockaded worse than those within. There was a castle in the neighbourhood called Arech,[3] pretty well fortified, from which the Turks made irruptions on the Christians, many of whom perished by the secret attacks of the country people. The Christian chiefs, being much grieved at this, marched out of their camp, and offering battle to the Turks pretended to fly and artfully led them to the spot where Bohemond and his troops were placed in ambush. Two [thousand][4] Christians were slain there. Then Bohemond,

[1] *Cursitores*, a term well rendered in a military sense by the French word *Chasseurs*. It is frequently used by our author in his narrative of these campaigns in the East, but not in the sense of light troops employed in opening or keeping up the communications of the army, but, as being in advance to provide what we should now call the commissariat for the main body.

[2] William of Tyre relates the cruel stratagem by which Bohemond rid the camp of these spies.

[3] The castle of Harench, built on a hill, at two hours' distance from the Iron-bridge, still bears the name of *Kirliz-Kalessi*, the Girl's Castle, by the translation of which Albert d'Aix describes it. It had been conquered by Tancred, with almost all Cilicia, after his departure from Malmistra, but retaken by the Moslems.

[4] Our author has made a serious error, which is entirely his own, in

the bravest of the warriors, rose from his ambuscade and falling on the Turks killed many of them, and taking some alive caused them to be beheaded before the gate of the town, as a warning to others. At length the besiegers built a fort on the summit of a hill which they called Maregard,[1] which was guarded daily by each of the chiefs taking his turn in succession. Meanwhile, provisions began to run short, as they could neither draw them from the country, nor purchase supplies, and they had carelessly consumed all they found in the valley. Every article of food therefore became very dear, and famine stared them in the face, inasmuch as their stock daily grew less; so that the enemy in the city made open demonstrations of joy.

In the year of our Lord 1097, the fifth indiction, after the celebration of the feast of Christ's nativity,[2] Duke Bohemond and Robert the Fleming marched out of the camp, amidst much lamentation from those who staid behind, at the head of a force of twenty thousand men, both cavalry and infantry with which they overran the settlements of the Saracens. The Arabs and Turks from Jerusalem and Damascus, and other cities of various provinces, had assembled in a body for the relief of Antioch.[3] Hearing, therefore, that the crusaders were scattered through the country, they exulted in the hope of being able to crush them, as they reckoned them to be few in number and mere adventurers. They consequently in the darkness of the night, posted two bodies of troops in ambuscade, one in front the other in the rear of the crusaders. But the warlike Count of Flanders and Bohemond made a joint attack upon them at dawn of day, and calling on the name of Jesus and crossing themselves,

rendering the words *duo milites*, which occur in Balderic's narrative, into *duo millia*. There were, indeed, it appears, two thousand men slain, but it was on the side of the Mahometans.

[1] This mountain was called Mauregard (Mal-Regard) by the Crusaders, who were annoyed at its commanding their camp, and especially Bohemond's position.

[2] Monday, December 28, 1097.

[3] Another circumstance, which revived the courage of the Mussulmans, was the continuance of the feeble state of health of Godfrey de Bouillon, who was not yet recovered from the effects of his struggle with the bear, and of the count of Tholouse, who did not regain his health until the following spring.

fought with great resolution, and slew a great number of the enemy. They were, however, able to secure but little booty, having no leisure to pursue and take the spoil.[1] Meanwhile, the Turks who garrisoned the city, learning that Bohemond was gone, boldly sallied forth and made inroads among the tents. Indeed, having thus explored the weakest points, they one day, before they heard of the defeat of their allies, assembled their whole force and made a general attack on the camp, coming to close quarters with the crusaders. On that occasion the Ishmaelites fought with great fury, and many of the Christians were slain. The standard-bearer of the bishop of Puy was among the number,[2] and had it not been for the marshes which lay between the city, and the camp and made the road almost impracticable, the enemy would have been able by a desperate effort to destroy the tents and make great havoc in the Christian army which had already been somewhat weakened.[3]

Bohemond, returning from the battle he had fought with the Saracens, in which he had secured but little booty, ascended some other lofty hills. But the country was now so devastated that many returned empty. Their toil had been therefore fruitless except that they had gained a great victory over the Turks. But victory will not allay hunger, when there is nothing to eat. Joy is of short duration when it is saddened by want of bread. Bohemond returned to the camp which was suffering cruelly the horrors of famine. However the Armenians and Syrians, whose thirst for gain is insatiable, finding that the expedition was come back

[1] The battle was fought on the 31st of December. Our author is mistaken with respect to the circumstance which prevented Bohemond and the count of Flanders from reaping the fruits of their victory. It was not time they wanted, but horses. There were scarcely a thousand fit for action in the whole army.

[2] Heraclius, the standard-bearer of the bishop of Puy, and youngest brother of Pons, viscount of Polignac. The Turks carried off the standard. According to Raymond d'Agiles, that knight was not carrying it at the moment when he was shot by an arrow in the face, of which wound, it is said, he died the 9th of June following.

[3] Our author has omitted to mention the bridge of boats, which greatly facilitated the operations of the siege, and which the Crusaders established at an early period on the Orontes, above the bridge of Antioch, and nearly opposite the gate which was afterwards called the Duke's Gate. The marsh here spoken of was in front of the Dog's Gate.

without supplies, searched for provisions in likely places at a great distance, and buying them up resold at an enormous profit what they had purchased at a low rate. The richer pilgrims bestowed large donations on the poor and those who went about begging; but it was impossible to maintain so many thousand souls any great length of time. Some began to think of deserting the camp. William Carpenter and Peter the Hermit crept out by stealth, but Tancred discovered and arrested them, and after a sharp rebuke compelled them to return to the army. Bohemond also, before whom they were brought, gave them bitter words and treated them with the contempt they deserved.[1] Men and horses were now in equal want of food, and despair of relief began to prevail. So many of the horses had failed that in the whole of that immense army, scarcely a thousand mounted knights and men-at-arms could be found. Tatan, the Greek, the commander of the emperor's troops, was so appalled by the prospect of perishing in the common calamity, that he undertook a mission to the emperor, and after making great promises to assist his companions as soon as he could, took his leave and never returned.[2] He faithfully reported to his master Alexius the courage and constancy, and the great privations of the besiegers, and exhorted Guy, son of Duke Guiscard,[3] and the noble chiefs of the Franks who had followed the first crusaders with numerous troops, but were honourably detained by the emperor at Constanti-

[1] Every kind of reproach was heaped upon the deserters. William Carpenter, viscount of Melun, was reminded in no gentle terms of the dishonourable termination of his campaign against the Moors in Spain: "Probably, wretch, you were ready to betray these knights and soldiers of Christ, as you did before in Spain," were the words of Bohemond.

Guy Troussel was also one of the deserters, and soon afterwards succeeded in making his escape, though he had taken the most solemn oaths to remain for ever faithful to the standard of the cross. See Ralph de Caen, who calls him Guy the Red.

[2] Even the duke of Normandy was so disheartened that he retired to Laodicea, and did not return to the camp till he was thrice summoned. According to Ralph of Caen, Robert was invited to Laodicea by the garrison, which consisted of English refugees (see vol. ii. p. 357), placed there by the Greek emperor, who, weary of the Byzantine yoke, were willing to make a voluntary submission to the son of the king, to escape whose dominion they had chosen to become exiles from their native country.

[3] This young prince died on his return from the Holy Land, in 1107.

nople, to hasten to the relief of their friends. On hearing distinctly how matters stood, the emperor assembled a powerful force, and put himself in march with a large convoy of provisions to succour the crusaders; but evil counsels, as will appear hereafter, prevented the accomplishment of his laudable enterprise.

Meanwhile, the crusaders, reduced to extremity, deserted privately, every one going where he thought he could find the means of existence; but no one dared to make for the sea-coast, as the roads and paths on that side were strictly watched. Fresh reports were also brought that a countless host of Turks were advancing, and that the whole army was threatened with immediate destruction. It was said that the numbers of the enemy were so great that a space measuring several furlongs square would not contain them. The crusaders trembled with alarm, and many of them drooped their fainting heads. But the nobles still dared to talk of fighting; and assembling in council mutually encouraged each other. Finding this, the wise Bohemond warmly congratulated them, and proposing judicious measures, encouraged them to resistance with much eloquence. He gave orders that the infantry should remain in the camp and narrowly watch the city gates, lest if they were opened the citizens might make sallies at pleasure. All the knights then armed themselves, invoking the name of the Lord Jesus, and having strengthened their good resolutions by receiving the holy sacrament, set forward, followed by the lamentations of all orders. No one had any assurance of his own safety, whether priest or woman, common soldier or knight. Both parties despaired of ever seeing each other again. Those who were dear to each other embraced by turns, and all were melted to tears. The knights established themselves on the bank of the river anciently called Daphne,[1] which flows between Antioch and a lake, having heard that the Turks had collected their forces at the castle of Arech, on the further side of the Iron Bridge. The watchful chiefs of the crusaders assembled before day-light, and at the first blush of dawn sent out wary horsemen to reconnoitre the

[1] The Daphne, now called the *Doueir*, is two hours' march from Antioch, on the road to Lattakia, to the west of the city, and on the right of the Orontes, into which it discharges its waters.

enemy. They soon returned shouting that the Turks were at hand, and were formed in two strong divisions; they had seen them moving rapidly forward from the other bank of the river. The Christian chiefs then discussed the order of battle, which they determined to leave altogether to Bohemond's judgment. He therefore divided his force into six troops, five of which were to advance and bear the brunt of the enemy's onset, repelling it by a spirited charge, while Bohemond, with his own troop, was to bring up the rear at a short distance, as a reserve to support the others as occasion required, and in case the Turks should rout the foremost troops to be ready to meet the full tide of the battle. The clarions sounded the charge, and it was echoed back by the trumpets of the Christian cavalry, and with loud cries on both sides the fierce battle began. Both parties closed hand-to-hand; armour clashed against armour, and shield against shield, and swords were hacked against broken spears. The reserves of the Turks were brought up and made a desperate charge on the Christians. The Franks could not sustain such attacks from so many assembled nations, and began to stagger and give way. The cries were fearful, and the air was darkened by clouds of whizzing darts. Bohemond who saw the whole, watching it as if he was all eyes, cried with a groan, "Christ, support thy faithful ones!" He then added, "Robert (Robert Fitz-Gerard carried his pennon[1]), put spurs to your horse, and hasten undaunted to the succour of the Christians, who are giving way! Remember, I pray you, our race, and do not tarnish the glorious name of Frenchmen! Be confident that we shall speedily have aid from Heaven, but it is God's will, that like brave champions, we should merit as well as receive the reward of courage."

Robert having devoutly fortified himself with the sign of the cross, galloped forward, surrounded by an auxiliary troop, and like a brave knight fell on the fiercest of the

[1] Bohemond's pennon was red, the colour of the ensigns of Normandy and the Scandinavian nations. "In Norway, red seems to have been the national colour from an early period. Something similar was also probably the case in Denmark." Worsaae's Danes and Norwegians in England, &c., pp. 61, 62. Hence, probably, the scarlet uniforms peculiar to the Danish and English armies.

Turks, closing with the infidels so near that the fringe of Bohemond's pennon floated in their faces, and they recoiled a few paces as he shouted his war cry. The Franks regained their courage at this desperate charge and the cries which accompanied it, and made a combined attack on the Turkish squadrons. Loud was the clash of arms, and sparks were struck from the brazen helmets; wounds followed wounds and the earth was dyed with purple blood. On every side were seen intestines torn out, decapitated heads and dismembered bodies. The Turks were struck with panic, and their troops at first staggered and then took to flight, pursued by the Franks beyond the Iron-bridge. The Turks lost a vast number of horsemen, but there was no infantry engaged. The crusaders returned in triumph to their camp, bringing with them a number of horses of which they had the greatest need, and much spoil which they had taken in the battle. The Turks retired, shamefully discomfited, to their castle of Arech which they dismantled and burnt, and then continued their retreat. The Armenians and Syrians, discovering this, made haste to occupy the defiles, and put many of them to the sword, but some they brought away alive. They also gave up the castle of Arech to the crusaders. The Franks brought into the camp a hundred heads of the slain, for the encouragement of their own army and to terrify the besieged. All this was seen by the envoys of the emir of Babylonia, who had been sent on a mission to Antioch, and pitched their tents near the crusaders' camp.[1] The troops who had remained in their intrenchments during the battle were engaged all day in assaulting the garrison of Antioch, and constantly watched the three gates of the city to prevent their making sallies. The battle was fought on Tuesday, the ides[2] of February [9th] being the day preceding the first day of Lent.

Though the people of Antioch had been defeated in every engagement, and they had sustained considerable losses by death, wounds or captivity, the numbers of the citizens were so great, that being now inflamed to the highest pitch of fury their attacks on the Christians were more impetuous, they

[1] The ambassadors of Aboulcassam Mostali, the sixth Fatimite Sultan of Egypt, 1094—December 11, 1101.

[2] It should be the sixth of the ides (Tuesday, the 9th) of February.

never suffered the camp to be at rest, but made frequent sallies in which blood was continually shed. Besides this, the crusaders were under many disadvantages, being neither able to raise the siege nor to leave the camp for any considerable distance. The country round was become such a desert that it yielded them no means of subsistence, while the Turks who knew its resources better were able to procure supplies, and always ready to fall on the Christians by surprise. Moreover, there was not a city, castle or town, nor man nor woman, nor any living creature that was not in hostility to the crusaders. All access was obstructed, that traders might not come and traffic with them, so that they were exposed to the horrors of famine.

In consequence, the nobles anxiously consulted on the means of relieving the people, and determined to fortify a mosque in order to interdict the Turks from passing the bridge.[1] It was resolved that Duke Bohemond and Raymond, count of Tholouse, should proceed to Port St. Simeon,[2] and bring up the troops who were waiting there to join in the siege. Those who remained in the camp set to work in a body, and under arms, to begin building the fort.[3] On the other hand, the Turks equal in numbers and not less determined than the Franks attacked the workmen, and their onset was so severe that they drove them off and killed many of them. Discovering also that two of the principal chiefs had left the camp for the port of St. Simeon, they laid in wait for them on a well-chosen spot and made a fierce attack. The Saracens aimed at the Christians with arrows,

[1] The mosque, where we shall presently find the Mussulmans burying their dead who fell in battle, stood on the right bank of the river, and facing the bridge at no great distance.

[2] A description of this port (now called Soueydya) is given in vol. ii., p. 420. It takes five hours to travel from thence to Antioch, the road running on the right bank of the Orontes.

[3] Raymond, count of Tholouse, undertook to superintend the erection and defence of this fortification. The party detached to Port St. Simeon had for their principal object to procure and bring back workmen qualified to engage in it. But the author of the Holy War (ch. lvi.) informs us that all the Crusaders assisted in the operations, which consisted in throwing up an immense earthwork as well as a wall and two towers. It appears from this that it was rather an entrenched camp than a fort or castle, and the rest of the chapter proves that the intention was not only to intercept the passage of the bridge over the Orontes, but to break it down.

swords, spears, darts, and all sorts of missiles, sweeping them down without mercy, and uttered loud cries, gnashing their teeth. A body of men were returning with the chiefs who were neither well armed nor used to war. The small band of crusaders were unable to withstand the fierce attack of their raving enemies, and after losing more than a thousand men, the rest took to flight. Such are the chances of war, such the vicissitudes of human affairs, as well as of seasons. No one was ever fortunate under all circumstances, no one ever has or ever will enjoy uninterrupted prosperity. In success therefore we must fear and guard against misfortunes, and in adversity we may hope for better times.

Reports that the Christians were overpowered filled with anxiety those who had remained in the camp; more especially as no certain accounts were given of the living or the dead. Many escaped by climbing the mountains, and soon found their way to the camp. Bohemond, taking the shortest road, arrived before the count of Tholouse, and gave an exact statement of the losses he had incurred. The crusaders were more exasperated than alarmed at the intelligence; and, roused to vengeance for the loss of their comrades, made a general attack on the Turks with great spirit. On both sides they fought resolutely. The Turks had crossed the bridge, when the Christians boldly met them, and, contrary to their expectations, received them with great fury, and falling upon them, forced them to seek safety in flight, but there was no possibility of escaping the swords of their pursuers. In the rear of the fugitives there was a narrow bridge, over a deep and rapid river.[1] There was no other passage; no one could ford, and few could swim across the stream in the neighbourhood of the bridge. Great numbers of the Turkish horsemen crowded together on the crown of the arch, and the Franks, eager for victory and revenge of their comrades' deaths, cut them down as if they were beasts of prey. In their insatiable fury they charged with their lances and engaged in close combat with their swords. Some they forced into the river, and others they mortally wounded. The stream was dyed with blood, and

[1] The thickest of the fight appears to have been on the bridge itself, which was not yet commanded by the works in progress, under the count of Tholouse.

the bank was encumbered with corpses. The gallant Godfrey drove his sword across the back of a warrior of enormous stature, who wore golden armour, as if he had been a succulent leek. The head, and shoulders, and upper part of the body, as far as the belt, fell into the river, while the lower part remained on his spirited horse, which, no longer held by the reins, but still pricked by the spurs, galloped through the foremost of the throng of fugitives to the city gate.[1] All who were on the battlements and bulwarks witnessing this spectacle were filled with dismay, and, amid their grief, told strange tales of the wonderful exploit of the stout knight. A day of death in every form, a day in which scarce any of the assembled multitudes would escape with their lives, lowered upon the pagans. From the tops of the towers and walls, the women looked down on the disasters of their countrymen, and envied the successes of the Franks. In that battle twelve chiefs, who are called emirs, and fifteen hundred distinguished horsemen were slain, the rest were deterred by their fears from attacking the Christians. Night put an end to the conflict, and the crusaders, rejoicing in the name of Christ, returned triumphantly to their camp, bringing with them many horses and much booty. The next day the Turks collected their dead, and interred them in a mosque over the bridge, before the city gate. They buried with them their mantles and rich garments, adding, for the use of the deceased, their bows and quivers, and a large quantity of bezants. The Crusaders discovering this, dug up the bodies, and, having pillaged all the valuables, threw the mortal remains with contempt into one deep grave. They also drove to the city gate four mules' loads of the heads of the slain, to the inexpressible grief of the citizens and the Babylonish envoys.

Three days afterwards, the crusaders began to erect the fortifications which have been already mentioned, and constructed them of stones removed from the graves they had

[1] Henry of Huntingdon and Matthew Paris, who both relate this astonishing feat of strength and dexterity, performed by Godfrey de Bouillon, describe also a parallel achievement of the duke of Normandy, only, in this case, the sword-cut, instead of being horizontal, clove the Turk through helmet, head, neck, and shoulders, down to the breast.

disturbed.[1] When the works were sufficiently advanced, the Franks began to restrain the enemy within narrower bounds. They also commanded free communication with the hilly country, and were able to procure more liberal supplies of forage and other provender. Still they had not as yet pitched their tents on the other side the river, and the Turks had free egress in that quarter.[2]

A fort was therefore erected by common consent on the other side of the river,[3] and the magnanimous Tancred engaged with the chiefs of the Franks to undertake to guard it, all the others declining its custody. Putting himself, therefore, at the head of his fellow soldiers and retainers, he manned the works, closely blockaded the city, and kept strict watch over the roads and approaches. One day he caught the Syrians and Armenians conveying, as they were wont, large stores of supplies into the place, and instantly attacking them, got possession of the whole convoy, which he conducted in triumph to the camp. The inhabitants of Antioch and their adherents became now much alarmed, having suffered such frequent disasters and losses.[4] The

[1] The tombstones of the Turkish cemetery furnished the materials for facing the two towers built by the Christians to flank the mosque, which Peter Tudebode calls the devil's temple. Our author omits mentioning the conflicts which took place on the bridge after these works were completed, as well as that at the same time they erected this fortification, the crusaders blocked up with timber and masses of rock, the bridge at the Dog-gate, which stood at the N.W., opposite the camp of the count of Tholouse, by which the besieged were constantly making very annoying and murderous sallies. This bridge formed a causeway over a marsh which lay between the city gate and the camp of the Crusaders.

[2] Our author here makes a serious mistake. The formation of the entrenched camp entrusted to the count of St. Giles, had for its express object to exclude the besieged from the right bank of the Orontes, in which it succeeded; and it is of that he means to speak, as Tancred's fort was erected on the other side of the river.

[3] This was another fort constructed, not as our author says, on the other side of the river, but on this side, viz., near the west gate, called the gate of St. George. It was erected on the site of an ancient monastery, and its ruins are still called the convent of St. George, which was probably the name of the monastery. Tancred engaged to build and defend it for 400 silver marks. According to William of Tyre, he would have 100 marks for the building, and 40 marks per month for the pay of the garrison.

[4] Ordericus, as well as most historians of the crusades, have neglected to notice a truce concluded with the besiegers, which was interrupted by the murder of Walon. See Robert de St. Remi, l. v. This event is, how-

Franks were of a fierce spirit, naturally daring, and well trained in the art of war, and in consequence had manfully undertaken this expedition into distant regions and among strange nations. In their difficulties they had recourse to God, invoked his aid in seasons of distress, and did frequent penitence for their human infirmities.

One Pirrus Datianus,[1] of Turkish origin, who held three towers in the city of Antioch, had formed a connection with Bohemond, of whom he had heard good reports, by means of confidential messengers who went to and fro between them. They had even frequent conferences through faithful interpreters, and signals, which were agreed on. Bohemond on some occasions tried to convert this person to Christianity; sometimes he used all the arguments he could think of to induce him to betray the city to the besiegers, and left no means untried which would suggest themselves to a man of sagacity. At one time he impressed on him the calamities which impended on the citizens, at another he invited him to become a Christian by holding forth the rich rewards which were promised by the Divine goodness. At last Pirrus was persuaded by his noble friend to give him possession of the three towers,[2] promising also to deliver his son as an hostage, and recommending him to lose no time in completing the enterprise. The prudent Bohemond concealed the secret satisfaction he now felt, and suffered no signs of it to appear in his countenance and conversation. He discoursed with the chiefs on the difficulty of taking the

ever, one of the most interesting episodes connected with the siege of Antioch. According to Gilon's metrical narrative, the wife of this warrior must have been a daughter of Hugh the Great, named Humberge, who is not mentioned by the genealogists.

[1] Read *Phirous*, and see in Ralph of Caen the motives which that author assigns for his conduct. Kemal-Eddin, historian of Aleppo, calls Phirouz *Zerrad*, or the armourer. It is impossible to conjecture what our author means by assigning to this person the surname of Datianus, which has nothing oriental about it.

[2] Phirouz did not put the crusaders in possession of three towers, but of one tower bearing the name of the Three Sisters, of which he had the custody, and another in the neighbourhood, where his brother commanded. These two towers, the ruins of which may still be seen, were not as lofty as those on the south ramparts, and might be escaladed without much difficulty. That of the Three Sisters is the first to the south of the gate of St. George, and the other is the second.

city, the weariness of the protracted siege, and the exemplary constancy of the victorious army, and he proposed that the dominion of Antioch and its territory should be conferred, by common consent of the chiefs, on that one of their number who should obtain possession of it either for money, or by force of arms, or by fair means, or stratagem. The chiefs were far from lending a willing ear to this proposition, alleging that it should belong to them all, as they had contributed by their joint exertions to the success of the enterprise. After hearing the opinion of several of his companions, Bohemond observed a prudent silence, waiting for a favourable opportunity of accomplishing his object. Soon afterwards common report, the forerunner of evil, noised in the camp that the Turks, Publicans,[1] Azulans, Azimites,[2] and several other heathen nations, were on the march, and had leagued to make war on the crusaders. The truth of these reports of imminent peril was soon confirmed by messengers who could be depended on. Thereupon the Christian chiefs, having consulted together, made a voluntary offer to Bohemond in the following terms: "You see the critical position of affairs; if, therefore, you can get possession of the city either by fair words or for money, with all the assistance we can give you, it shall be yours by common consent, save only the fealty which, with your approbation, we swore to the emperor. If he keeps his engagements and comes to our aid, observing the terms of

[1] The text should be *Populicani*. They had separated from the sect of the Manichees, who took the name of Paulicians, from one Paul, who had introduced some innovations into their creed. Being favoured by the emperor Nicephorus (802—July 25, 811) they founded a small state in Armenia. But, being persecuted by his successor in 812, and the empress Theodora in 848, they placed themselves under the protection of the caliphs, who gave them settlements in Cappadocia and Armenia the Less. There is a very curious letter from Lewis the Younger to the pope (*Hist. de Fr.*, xv. 790), which proves that the doctrines of this sect had not only reached the coast of France, which was always in communication with the East, but had penetrated into the most northern provinces of the kingdom. Several Manichean and Gnostic sects were also introduced in consequence of the crusades, and planted in various parts of the country.

[2] Azimitea, a name given by the schismatic Greeks to the Latin catholics, But it is here applied to some of the auxiliary forces of the Mussulmans. They were probably Christians who used unleavened bread for consecrating the host, according to the custom of the church of Rome.

the treaty sworn between us, we will not perjure ourselves, but you must allow us to say, we will surrender the place to him; but if not it shall be for ever under your dominion."

In consequence, Bohemond had frequent communications with Pirrus, who, nothing loth, sent him his son as hostage. "Let your herald," said he, "proclaim aloud throughout your camp, that the army of the Franks shall make preparation to-day for entering the country of the Saracens to-morrow for the purpose of pillaging it; and by this means our project will be concealed from both sides. When our people understand that the main body of the enemy is gone on a distant expedition, the strictness of their night-watch will be relaxed; do you then hasten with great secrecy to fix scaling-ladders to the walls, and without making any noise, mount boldly, and take possession of the towers I have promised to deliver to you. Then take your measures for completing the enterprise; use your swords, and be not so stupid as to neglect any thing which ought to be done. I shall remain on the watch myself, alive to all that passes, and anxiously expecting your arrival."

Bohemond, therefore, ordered his herald, who was called Mala-Corona, to proclaim through the camp that all the troops were to proceed on the morrow to ravage the enemy's country. However, he entrusted the entire secret to Duke Godfrey, to the count of Flanders, and the duke of Normandy, and the count of Thoulouse, and bishop of Puy, and some of the other chiefs; Tancred and his counsellors had been privy to the whole affair from the beginning."[1] Stephen of Chartres was absent, being, as he said, detained by severe illness at Alexandretta, whither he had gone for the recovery of his health.[2] The Christian army, ignorant of

[1] This is incorrect. Tancred was not even one of the first of the crusaders who entered the city; and he severely reproached Bohemond for having kept him in the dark respecting his negociations with Phirouz. See Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, lxx.

[2] This knight, to whom the crusaders had entrusted the supreme command and the direction of their operations, had, indeed, the cowardice to retire to Alexandretta with four thousand men, under pretence of illness, a very few days before Antioch was stormed. According to Fulcher of Chartres, he withdrew on the very eve of this important event. But it would seem almost impossible that, in his position of commander-in-chief, he had received no intelligence up to that late period of the understanding

what was intended, marched out of the camp towards evening, and being led through some by-ways, found itself before dawn near the city, having reached it by the nearest roads. Meanwhile, Bohemond gave directions to his chosen followers to convey with great caution the scaling-ladders he had prepared to the wall, and mounting them confidently without noise, to accomplish the rest by their arms and courage as prudence should direct. A Lombard of the name of Paganus was the first to mount, though in considerable trepidation; he was followed by Fulcher of Chartres,[1] Roger de Barneville, Geoffrey Parented, de Castro Secred,[2] and others to the number of about sixty, who were cautiously admitted by Pirrus and lodged in his towers. When, however, he saw that no more followed, he was in great distress, and exclaimed, it is said, in his mother-tongue: *Heu! Heu! Mikro Francos echomen*;[3] that is, we have few Franks. Upon this the Lombard hastily descended the ladder, and called from above to Bohemond, who was waiting below: "What are you doing? Are you asleep? Send up instantly all you intend, for we are already in possesion of these towers without any loss; otherwise you will lose us, as well as the city, and ruin your friend, who has trusted you with his hopes and even his life." On hearing this, Bohemond and

which subsisted between Bohemond and Phirouz, and would not have remained in the camp twenty-four hours longer to wait the result.

[1] It appears that there were no less than four persons in the crusade of this name and surname:—

1. Fulcher of Chartres, the historian, who was chaplain to Baldwin of Boulogne.

2. Fulcher of Chartres, here mentioned as the second who scaled the walls of Antioch. According to Raymond d'Aigles, he was the first; and that author calls him "the brother of Budell of Chartres, not improbably the Bartholomew Boell, before-mentioned among the followers of Bohemond.

3. Fulcher of Chartres, who, according to Albert d'Aix, was slain at the same time as Walter Sans-Avoir, before Civitot.

4. Last, Fulcher of Chartres, to whom Baldwin gave the government of Balasen in Armenia.

According to Ralph of Caen, the first crusader who escaladed the walls of Antioch, was not Fulcher, but Gouel of Chartres; perhaps, by a misreading the Boell already mentioned.

[2] Castel-Sagrat, a little town near Agen, which, in the sixteenth century, belonged to a branch of the family of Gironde.

[3] Φεῦ, φεῦ, μιχρὸ Φράγγους ἔχομεν.

those who were with him, made for the wall as quick as thought, and a great number mounting the ladder, established themselves on the summit, and occupied, under the guidance of Pirrus, seven more towers. Cutting down every one they found within, they spread themselves along the walls, and rushed shouting through the streets, giving no quarter to all they met. The inhabitants, weary with the evils of a long siege, were roused with difficulty, and issued from their houses half asleep and unarmed. In this drowsy condition, and confused by the shouts of the assailants they rushed wildly out, unprepared for action, and, not knowing what was going on, mistook enemies for friends; so that wherever they appeared, they were struck down and butchered like sheep. Even the uterine brother of Pirrus was killed among the rest.[1] Meanwhile, so many crowded on the ladder to mount the walls, that it slipped down and was broken, so that none of the others who were waiting below at the foot of the walls could render any assistance to their comrades fighting above. But in their distress, a remedy was supplied by the mercy of God; for by his providence they found not far from the ladder, on feeling to the left, a gate[2] which they had seen some days before when reconnoitring the ground, and breaking it down forced an entrance. Then the cries grew louder, and the Christians had freer scope for fighting their way, while the Turks, overcome with sleep and wine, were plunged into the deeper sleep of death. Endeavouring to escape the perils that threatened them, they encountered the Christian troops, and when seeking to avoid their attacks, rushed on immediate death in some other quarter. By Bohemond's orders his standard was planted in the city, near the citadel which stood on the top of a hill.

The Christians got possession of Antioch on Wednesday,

[1] Most of the historians state that this brother was killed by Phirouz himself, to furnish the crusaders with a striking prooof of his firmness of purpose.

[2] M. Pojoulat thinks that this might be the gate of Olives, now called *Bab-Zetoun*, to the south of the gate of St. George; or rather another small gate, which has a cross over it (perhaps in remembrance of this event), which stood at the foot of the first or most western of the four hillocks included in the defence of Antioch.

the third of the nones [3rd] of June,[1] having put to the sword vast numbers of the Pagans. On that night, neither age nor sex, nor condition of any sort, received quarter; in its darkness the assailants were unable to distinguish the difference of sex. When day dawned, those who remained in the camp, roused by the tumultuous shouts of the people and the clang of the trumpets, beheld the ensign of Bohemond floating over the city, and, recognizing it, rejoiced at the capture of the place. No time was lost in rushing to the gates and getting in they seconded their companions with their whole force. Wherever the Turks were found contriving to escape they were butchered on the spot; some few only got away through the gates without being discovered by the impetuous Franks.

Cassian,[2] the chief of the Turks and emir of Antioch, escaped among these fugitives, and rode at full speed to the territory occupied by Tancred,[3] but the horse he had mounted and those of his attendants were so exhausted that he was forced to take refuge in a mean hut. As soon, however, as the Syrians and Armenians, inhabitants of that district who had suffered much under Cassian, discovered his retreat, they rushed upon him, to the number of twenty, and seizing him cut off his head[4] and brought it to Bohemond; thus securing

[1] Tuesday, June 3, 1098; not Wednesday, as our author states. He is not the only writer who dates the capture of Antioch from the moment at which Phirouz admitted the crusaders into his tower, which was towards the close of June 2. The romance of Godfrey de Bouillon, which echoes the received traditions, says,

Antioche fut prise un Mercredi au soir.

[2] The true name of the governor of Antioch (who is called Caspian by Stephen de Blois, Darsian by Albert d'Aix, Baghitian, Gratian &c., by other historians) appears from the oriental writers to have been *Bagui-Sian*, He was one of the Seljucide princes.

[3] The territory here described as belonging to Tancred was that part of Cilicia which had been conquered by that brave knight before the siege, including the cities of Malmestra, Alexandretta, Laodicea, &c. In the letter of Stephen de Blois to his wife Adela, which was dated the 29th of March, he tells her that the Christian army already held one hundred and sixty towns and castles in Syria.

[4] Albert d'Aix draws a striking likeness of this governor's head: "It was," he says, "of an extraordinary size; the ears were large and hairy; his hair was grey, as well as his beard which flowed from his chin down to his navel."

his favour and their own liberty. Thus perished Cassian, misled by his ill-fortune: it is uncertain whether he fled at random, without any plan of escape, or was on his way to seek for succour among his countrymen. But it is clear that if he had retired into the citadel, he would have done better. The streets and squares were so incumbered with corpses, that no one could pass them without difficulty, and those who traversed them were struck with horror and sickened by the intolerable stench.

CH. X. *The Turks hold the citadel of Antioch, after the capture of the place—A combined army of Moslems invest the city—Sufferings of the crusaders besieged in it—They gain a great victory, and the citadel surrenders.*

GREAT numbers of those who had flocked to the defence of Antioch, on hearing rumours that it was on the point of being taken, were put to the sword. Some escaped by taking refuge in the citadel; others sought safety in flight. Sensadolus,[1] Cassian's son, fled to Curboran,[2] commander of the forces of Soldan king of Persia, and with tears in his eyes informed him of the sad misfortunes of his father and his country. Cassian had sent frequent messages to this chief, during the siege of Antioch by the armies of the West, to entreat him to march to the relief of the place. Three days after the city was taken,[3] Sensadolus yielded himself up to Curboran with the citadel which commanded the place and all that he possessed, and moved him with tears and prayers and promises to undertake an expedition against the

[1] For Sensadolus, we find some other historians writing the name *Sensadonias* or *Sanzedona*, a corruption, perhaps of Schems-Eddaule, the Sun-of-the-Empire, a title of honour, conformable to the usages of the court of the Seljucide sultans. It appears that this son of Bagui-Sian surrendered the city with great reluctance to Kerboga, who made it an absolute condition of his interference.

[2] *Curboran.* Kerboga, prince of Mossoul, and lieutenant of the Seljucide sultan Barkiarok, son of Malek Shah, who governed the East under the nominal authority of the caliph Mostadher, son of Moctadi-Bamrillah.

[3] It was on Saturday, the 5th of May, the second day after Antioch was taken, that the citadel was given in charge to an officer appointed by Kerboga. M. Pojoulat informs us that this fortress, of which the ruins are still to be seen, was rectangular, and surmounted by fourteen small towers, seven to the east and seven to the west, as the author of the History of the Holy War states.

Christians. This emir was brave and warlike, prudent and wealthy, and ambitious of glory. He had received permission from the caliph,[1] the chief of his religion, to persecute the Christians, and he had sworn never to return until he had subdued Syria and Romania, and even Apulia. He felt great confidence in his resources, having countless multitudes of many nations under his command. The king of Damascus[2] and the emir of Jerusalem,[3] were his allies, and Turks and Agarenes, Arabs and Publicans, Azimites, Curds and Persians, with three thousand Agulans followed his standard. The Agulans wore steel armour, impenetrable by arrows or darts, and used no other arms but swords in their battles. This vast hostile army pitched their camp at the Iron-Bridge, taking by assault the fort there and putting the whole garrison to the sword, except the commander, who was bound with iron fetters and found in chains at the end of the war.[4] The Agarenes took some miserable arms from a few poor wretches, such as a rusty sword, a small lance, and a useless bow, and sent them in derision of the Franks, to Curboran, who sent them to Chorasan with insulting mockery and vain boasts, intended to rally the ignorant idolators against the Christians.

While these occurrences were taking place, Curboran's mother arrived from Aleppo on a visit to her son, and severely blamed him for engaging in his present enterprise,

[1] The caliph's commission could only be nominal, the real power having been vested, as we have already seen, in his lieutenant Barkiaroh. As for licence to kill the Christians, nothing but the ignorance of the manners of the Turks which prevailed among the authors of the middle ages, could have led them to think it necessary to be armed with it.

[2] Dekak, sultan of Damascus, son of Totousch.

[3] Sokman, son of Ortok. The western writers omit in this list Genah-Eddaule, prince of Emessa, and Vatab, son of Mahmoud, chief of some hordes of Nomade Arabs. The Mussulman army assembled towards the end of May in the neighbourhood of Aleppo. The implacable hatred which subsisted between Dekak and his brother Radonan, prince of Aleppo, appears to have been the cause of much dissension in the Mussulman camp. The intrigues of the former were particularly directed to act on the Turcomans, whose precipitate retreat at the first onset threw disorder into the ranks of the infidel army.

[4] It was on the 6th of June that the troops of Kerboga carried the two towers by assault; he then approached the city and remained two days in inaction.

predicting in the clearest terms that he would be defeated by the Christians, and perish within the year, not in battle, but by sudden death. This woman was very aged, being as much as a hundred years old; she foretold future events, consulting the stars, and being skilled in generation,[1] and many other sciences. The boastful prince soothed his distressed mother by lofty promises, and three days afterwards, taking arms, led a powerful force to the citadel which had been ceded to him. The crusaders marched out to oppose the advance of the Ishmaelites, but were unable to withstand so numerous and strong an army. They were quickly forced to retire into the city, and the crush was so great at the narrow entrance of the gates, that many were suffocated, the Turks pressing on them with great impetuosity.[2] Despair spread through the ranks of the crusaders; some however consoled the rest and talked of battle on the morrow. Some few, overcome by disgraceful and unfounded apprehensions, to their eternal shame, thought of making their escape during the night. William de Grantmesnil[3] and his brother Alberic, Guy Troussel[4] and Lambert the Poor,[5] with several others, were so terrified by the battle of the preceding day, and so anxious to escape the coming conflict, that they let themselves down from the walls by

[1] *Geniculorum.* Our author means to say that Kerboga's mother was versed in the superstitions of the Gnostics. It is not very likely that she lived at Aleppo, while her son was prince of Mossoul. Ordericus has shown his good sense in sparing the recital of the long dialogue, embellished by quotations from the Bible, which most of the historians have put into the mouths of these two persons.

[2] This happened on Tuesday the 10th of June. The battle lasted the whole of the next day.

[3] Brother-in-law of Bohemond. Ralph of Caen positively states that Ivo de Grantmesnil also joined his brother in this disgraceful transaction.

[4] Peter de Tudebode represents that Guy Troussel did not leave the army till this period, and adds to the list of deserters two others, one named William de Bernouville, the other William, son of Richard.

[5] Lambert, surnamed the Poor, count of Clermont, near Huy, in the province of Liége, and after his father's death, of Montagu (see vol. ii p. 75). They both followed Godfrey de Bouillon, their brother and uncle, to the Holy Land, and Lambert returning in 1105 with Peter the Hermit, founded in the suburbs of Huy a monastery of regular canons of the order of St. Augustin, of which Peter became the superior. It is supposed that Lambert was the second husband of Gertrude, daughter of Theodore d'Alsace, count of Flanders, and that he died in the year 1147.

ropes. In consequence of their everlasting shame, they were called the sneaking Funambulists.[1] Walking all night through a rocky country full of precipices, they arrived on foot, their hands and feet excoriated, with many companions, at the port of St. Simeon. They found a number of ships lying there, and terrified the crews, who were already in a state of great uncertainty by their alarming reports, giving out that the Turks had re-taken Antioch and massacred all the Christians. On receiving this intelligence, some of the sailors cut their cables, and leaving their anchors, put out to sea, hoisting their sails obliquely to the wind; others, more slow in their movements, dissembled their intentions; but all were filled with alarm and consternation. In the midst of this, the Turks who watched the coast, suddenly made their appearance, and putting to the sword the timid sailors, unprepared for defence, pillaged the ships which remained in port, and setting them on fire, massacred the cowards without ceremony.

The brave defenders of the city stood their ground all day against the attacks of the Turks, and by a sudden thought of the chiefs, ran up a loose wall of rough stones without mortar between the town and the citadel.[2] This useful barricade afforded shelter to the Christians in their defence of the place, while it seriously checked the assaults of the Turks. The Franks manned the wall with great zeal, constantly armed for battle, and neither indulging in sleep, nor occupying themselves with any other cares. Meanwhile famine began to spread among the Christians, and they were compelled to live on horses, asses, and other unclean things. In this extremity, the faithful invoked the Lord, and he heard their prayers.

The Lord Jesus appeared surrounded by a company of saints, to a priest who was watching by night in the church of St. Mary, while engaged in prayer for the suffering people of God, and complained that the soldiers of the cross polluted themselves by fornications with both foreign and

[1] They made their escape in the night of Friday, the 11th or probably the 12th of June.

[2] According to Peter Tudebode, this wall was not built until after the fire.

Christian harlots, adding severe threats on the debauched multitude. While he spoke a radiant crucifix shone over his head, by which the priest recognised the Redeemer of the world, and he fell on his face and worshipped. Then the blesed Mary, mother of mercy, and St. Peter, prince of the apostles, fell at the feet of the Lord the Saviour, and endeavoured to soften his anger by devout intercessions for the afflicted Christians, complaining of the pagans who had polluted the holy temple of God by their foul superstitions. When the holy mother and the apostle had finished their supplications, the Saint of saints yielded to them, and with a serene countenance commanded the priest to publicly rebuke the people and call them to repentance; and then, when they were truly converted, to promise in the name of God that divine help should be afforded them in their need within five days. The priest affirmed his report of this vision on oath upon the holy gospels and the crucifix, before the bishop of Puy and all the people. The multitude immediately gave way to lamentations, and exhorted one another to the confession of their sins. They were seen on all sides praying in the churches, with tears in their eyes and ashes on their heads and naked feet, imploring help and counsel from the Lord. The chiefs all swore, by a unanimous resolution, that not one of them while he lived would retire from the confederation until he had reached Jerusalem and kissed the holy sepulchre of Christ. Tancred also swore that as long as he had fifty soldiers he would never abandon the expedition to Jerusalem. This declaration much animated the Christians, restoring their courage and filling them with joy.

Peter Abraham, a Provençal clerk, related the following vision to his companions. "During the siege of Antioch," he said, "when we were undergoing much suffering and severe privations, St. Andrew the apostle appeared to me, and upon my asking his name, told it, and taking me to the church of St. Peter in this city,[1] pointed to a certain spot, and said, 'I wish you to know that when you shall be in possession of Antioch, you will find here the spear which pierced the Lord the Saviour's side on the cross. This

[1] M. Pojoulat could find no vestiges of this church, nor, indeed, of any other remains of the Christian monuments in Antioch.

weapon is very holy, and the Christians ought especially to revere it.' With these words the apostle vanished, and I had not confidence enough in any one to reveal the vision. On the city being taken, the apostle again appeared to me and said, 'Faint-hearted man, why have you not removed the spear?' I replied, 'My lord, if I should tell of it, who would believe me?' 'Despair not,' said the apostle, 'but know for certain that all I have said and shown you is very true. This revelation will confer great benefits on the harassed Christians, as it will inspire them with a holy confidence in this spear. Within five days the Lord will visit them, and deliver them by his power from the hands of their enemies.'" Peter made known this divine revelation to his companions, but the people disbelieved him, and laughed at his assertions. However he persisted in them, and confirmed them by his oath, and the people at last placed confidence in him, and recovered courage to bear their sufferings.

Meanwhile, the Turks in the castle made frequent sallies on the Franks, which they resisted with all their might. In the first conflict Roger de Barneville was slain,[2] and buried by the Christians in the church of St. Peter, with deep sorrow, for he was a Norman of great distinction, and a handsome and gallant knight. On one occasion, the Turks blockaded three Christians in one of the towers, and the Franks, worn out with their distresses, could afford them no relief. However, two of them though severely wounded, contrived to make their escape from the tower, and Hugh de Forsennat, a brave warrior belonging to the troop of Godfrey de Monte-Scabioso, was left alone, and stoutly defended himself the whole day. He cut down two Turks with his own hand, having no one to support him, and singly withstood the attacks of his assailants. He was, indeed, a bold and resolute man, and deserved praise more than any of the combatants. But the spirit of our people must have been then broken by their severe disasters, when they saw a comrade fighting all day single-handed without attempting to succour him, and heard his cries without answering them.

[1] It was not by the Turks from the citadel, but those who were encamped outside the walls, in one of whose attacks Roger de Barneville fell as early as the 6th of May, probably in the marsh near the Dog's-gate.

When the chiefs summoned the soldiers to action, they did not appear; when the trumpets sounded, they concealed themselves in the houses. Nay, helpless and fainting, they shrunk from the contest they had long desired, and were so disheartened and reckless that they desired death.

Bohemond and the other chiefs, perceiving that the courage of the troops had so entirely failed that they could not even prevail on them to man the wall between the castle and the city, set fire to the town in order to drive the skulking cowards from the houses and hiding places in which they concealed themselves.[1] The fire was lighted in that part of the city where the palace of Cassian towered over the rest, and it continued burning from the third hour of day to midnight. About two thousand houses and churches were laid in ruins. At last, the flames went out in consequence of the wind becoming calm. When the fire penetrated to the lodgings of the Christians, after hastily snatching up their booty, they were now compelled to join their chiefs, who assigned to each his station at the city gates to keep watch and ward. Then a severe conflict took place between the Franks and the Turks in the citadel; they came to close quarters and fought hand to hand, nor was the battle interrupted for a moment. The Turks being superior in numbers, better fed, and engaging by turns in successive divisions, left no means of annoyance untried, boldly rushed on the Franks, threw themselves fearlessly into the midst of the fight, and encouraged one another. The Franks, on the other hand, beyond measure distressed, could hardly stand, and no respite was allowed them either to take food or rest. They therefore commenced carrying up a lofty wall cemented with lime, as the Turks had easily thrown down the other built of loose stones.

One night a blazing light was seen hanging in the heavens in the western quarter,[2] which seemed to fall on the Turkish

[1] According to Ralph of Caen, it was the count of Flanders who set fire to the city, but Peter Tudebode, an eye-witness, asserts positively that this measure was adopted by Bohemond, as our author intimates.

[2] This phenomenon, perhaps the aurora-borealis, was also visible in Normandy; Ralph of Caen was eye-witness of it. According to Florence of Worcester, it did not appear until the 27th of September, several months after the period assigned here.

citadel and rage within it, and although it did no injury to the Gentiles, it filled them with alarm and disquietude. To the Christians it afforded comfort and joy; and both the people took it for a sign from heaven. The garrison of the citadel spent the whole day in hurling spears and darts, and inflicted wounds upon wounds. The besiegers had so closely invested the city from without that by day there was no possibility of ingress or egress; some however contrived to go out by night, but by stealth, and with much apprehension. The famine continually increased and tormented the Christians beyond all belief; many indeed died of hunger. A small cake baked on the embers, if perchance it could be procured, cost a bezant. The flesh of horses and asses was esteemed a dainty fit for an emperor, fowls were worth fifteen pence each. An egg sold for twopence, a walnut for a farthing, and the vilest commodities fetched several staters. It would be wearisome to detail the various sufferings, miseries, and torments, which the Christian soldiers endured for the thirty-six days[1] they were blockaded in the place. It was by such trials that the Almighty proved his champions, trying them in the furnace of affliction to purge them from their guilt, in order to give them a glorious triumph when purified from their sins.

Meanwhile Stephen, count of Chartres, had retired to Alexandretta for the recovery of his health,[2] and was detained there for some time, as it is said, by sickness. The crusaders impatiently waited his return, as all the chiefs looked to him as their prime leader and counsellor;[3] for he was a man of great eloquence and singular ability. Having heard that the Turks had invested the city, he cautiously ascended the

[1] This computation is much too low; the crusaders were blockaded in Antioch nearly two months.

[2] See before p. 122, where our author raises the same doubt whether the sickness was not pretended. Alexandretta is called by the Turks Scanderoun, giving its name to the gulf at the bottom of which it is built, on the opposite shore to Antioch. At any rate, it was a bad place to choose for the re-establishment of health. Its neighbourhood to pestilential marshes makes it quite uninhabitable at present during the heats of summer.

[3] Stephen, count of Chartres and Blois tells his wife Adele, in his letter to her, which is extant, that this pre-eminence was conferred on him by the chiefs with the common consent of the whole army, against his will. See note in ch. ix. p. 122, on the previous conduct of this general of the crusaders.

hills above Alexandretta, which is not very far from Antioch, and saw from the heights the innumerable tents of the Turks, and their forces covering the plains like the sand on the sea shore; nor could he fail of comprehending the condition of the small body of crusaders shut up in the beleaguered city. This spectacle filled him with such consternation, that he fled with his attendants from the spot in the utmost haste, and, using great precaution, returned to his fortress, which he stripped of everything. He then retreated in the direction in which the emperor Alexius was advancing with a powerful army to the relief of the besieged, and, falling in with him at the town of Philomenes,[1] called him aside and thus addressed him: "You have received certain intelligence of the capture of Antioch by the crusaders, but the Turks retain possession of the citadel which is very strong and commands the town. They also blockade and besiege our troops who are in the occupation of the place, or I should rather say they have taken it by assault and put the Christians to the sword. Look, therefore, to your own safety and that of your troops."

Guy, Bohemond's brother, and numbers both of Franks and Greeks were hastening to the succour of the besieged, but the emperor, summoning them to his presence announced his determination. He then issued orders for the retreat of the whole army, laying waste all the country round, and making the inhabitants retire into Bulgaria, so that if the Turks should attempt to pursue them they might fail of finding subsistence in the depopulated region. The sad news too easily promulgated by the credulous count, plunged the people of God in the deepest affliction. For three days the bishops, abbots, and priests, discontinued the prayers and praises of divine worship and abandoned themselves to sighs and groans. The emperor, giving too much credence to the report of Stephen of Chartres, returned to Constantinople, and the glory of victory and triumph over the Turks was reserved for others to whom it rightfully belonged. The Franks retreated with the utmost reluctance bitterly lamenting the order, and many of the poorer pilgrims died here and there on the road.

Guy, Robert Guiscard's son, poured forth unceasing

[1] Philomelium, near Antiochetta.

lamentations for the fate of his brother and his friends, so as to draw tears both from his acquaintance and from strangers, while at the same time he overwhelmed Stephen of Chartres with reproaches. However, he had no choice but to return, sorrowing, with the emperor and his auxiliary forces.

And now the soldiers of God in Antioch, being reduced to the last extremity, placed all their hopes in heaven, and consulted with confidence on the means of discovering the holy spear. In consequence they assembled in the church of St. Peter, and long disputes were held respecting the place where it was to be found. At length the opinion of the majority prevailed, and thirteen strong and laborious men were employed in carefully digging. They turned up the soil from morning until evening, and at last found the spear in the presence of the same Peter to whom it had been revealed.[1] It was lifted from the spot among general acclamations, crowds of people running to see it, and covering it with kisses of devotion. Their joy was so great, that, no longer dispirited, they forgot their griefs, and from that moment took courage to think of war.

The Christians agreed in council that two enterprising men, Peter the Hermit and Herluin, who spoke the Turkish language, should proceed on a mission to Curboran, and, on the part of God and his people, enjoin him and his followers to retire peaceably with all they possessed from the city which St. Peter the apostle had converted to Christ. They added that if the Turks aspired to the sacrament of baptism, the Christians would receive them as real brothers, and would make a treaty of perpetual peace with them: if not they might arm themselves and prepare for battle, if they dared.[2] Curboran received with disdain the message of the envoys, and, utterly rejecting the proposal that he should embrace Christianity, he treated the crucified King with contempt, called St. Peter a superstitious impostor, and said that our religion was a most absurd sect. He called on the Christians

[1] The discovery was made, according to Peter Tudebode, on the 14th of June; others say the 19th. Bohemond's excellent arguments against the genuineness of the holy spear, may be seen in Ralph de Caen, ch. cii.

[2] If the Oriental writers are to be believed, this mission had no other object but to obtain an honourable capitulation; but all the Latin writers put into Peter the Hermit's mouth language similar to that employed by our author.

to believe in Mahomet, and recommended them, if they contemned his faith to take to flight. The envoys, proceeding on their journey in return, hastily made their appearance, and assured the Christian army that a battle was at hand. Meanwhile the famine increased, and fear of the Turks still somewhat unmanned the courage of the timid. Having at length completed a fast of three days enjoined by the priests, and chanted litanies in processions to the churches, while every Christian man prepared himself for death by taking the host as a viaticum, the crusaders were arrayed for battle, being formed into seven divisions in the heart of the city.

In the first division, Hugh the Great, with Robert earl of Flanders, took the command of thirty thousand Frenchmen and Flemings.

In the second division were stationed Duke Godfrey and Eustace his brother with Count Conon[1] and thirty thousand of the bravest warriors of Germany, Lorraine, and Boulogne.

In the third division Duke Robert was at the head of his Normans, with fifteen thousand troops from Maine, Anjou, Brittany, and England.

The fourth division included Aimar, bishop of Puy, with the rest of the bishops and ecclesiastics, among whom was Peter Abraham, who bore the lance of our Lord;[2] the crusaders being desirous to have it carried before them, and believing that it was their great safeguard and protection.

In the fifth division was Rainald,[3] a valiant count, with four thousand men of Teutonic and Bavarian race.

[1] Conon, the first count of Montagu, mentioned in history, was son of Gozelon, count of Bohagne, who died in 1064, and Ermentrude d'Harenzey. Notwithstanding the silence of the French genealogists it seems certain that Conon was brother-in-law of Godfrey and Baldwin, by his marriage with their sister Ida of Boulogne. This nobleman, who appears to have returned from the Holy Land with his son Lambert and Peter the Hermit in 1101, died the 30th of April, 1105, at the castle of Dolhain, near Liége, and was buried at Dinant. The castle of Montagu stood on the banks of the Ourthe, between Marche and La Roche, in the province of Luxembourg.

[2] It was Raymond d'Agiles, the historian of this crusade, and canon of Puy, and Adhemar's chaplain, who carried the holy lance.

[3] This is incorrect. At first there were only six divisions, and Peter Tudebode says: "In the fifth was Tancred, son of the marquis, with Gaston of Bearn and his vassals, and the followers of the count of Poitou." Such troops as there were from Germany and the eastern part of France, com-

The sixth, composed of four thousand men-at-arms from Apulia, was led by Tancred.

The seventh was under the command of Bohemond, duke of Apulia, and numbered thirty thousand Lombards and Italians. This division was the last to march out of the city, and was to provide against all emergencies, and be a reserve to support the other divisions in time of need.

Raymond, count of Tholouse,[1] remained with twenty thousand troops to guard the city, and prevent any assault by the Gentiles, who, to the number of many thousands, occupied the camp of St. Peter near the walls. While the Christians marched out, the bishops and priests exhorted and prayed, standing on elevated spots, from which they made the sign of the adorable cross over all the troops as they passed.

As the divisions in regular order marched out of the city-gate, which is near the Mosque,[2] imploring from their inmost souls the powerful succour of the merciful God, a gentle rain fell from the skies, its still drops moistening and refreshing the horses and riders like morning dew. The steeds gave token of their satisfaction by beginning to neigh, and the spirits of the horsemen were invigorated by the cooling moisture, while the whole army was exhilarated, and moved with increased alacrity. Yet the shower was so gentle and evanescent that it could hardly be called rain, but soft dewdrops which were felt rather than seen. This is related by many persons worthy of credit who were witnesses of it.

As soon as Curboran[3] perceived that the Christians were

posed part of Godfrey's division. Later in the day, a seventh division was hastily formed from those of Godfrey and the duke of Normandy, upon its being observed that the manœuvres of the Mussulmans tended to cut off entirely the retreat of the crusaders, either towards Antioch, or to the port of St. Simeon, by means of a body of troops which occupied the right bank of the Orontes from the sea to the bridge of Antioch. This seventh division was commanded by the count de Toul. Our author himself gives an account of this a little further on.

[1] The count of Tholouse was detained at Antioch in consequence of a wound.

[2] The Bridge-gate. The principal contest lay on the right bank of the Orontes, between the river and the Black Mountains. Kerboga commanded in person on the left bank.

[3] Kerboga, prince of Mossoul; see note before p. 126, most of the his-

marching out to battle, he said: "These people are hastening rather to fly than to fight; let them approach us quite close, that we may have them in our power to devour at our leisure. Let them march out! Let them march out! We will presently surround them, and defeat and crush them!" The Christians, however, marched forward, keeping the step, no one breaking the ranks by undue haste. Curboran, seeing them approach under arms in such good order, without wavering as if they were under any alarm, but keeping the measured time and pace,—did not blush to add: "These worthless curs seem as if they mean to venture on fighting." He was then struck with sudden terror, his limbs lost their powers, and his heart was frozen. In consequence, he gave secret orders to his lieutenant, who is called an emir, that if he saw the smoke from a fire lighted in front of the army,[1] he might conclude that his comrades were certainly defeated, and should immediately give the signal for retreat, and withdraw the troops under his command, that the whole body who were with him, and in the camp, might not be cut off. Then, seeing the Christians advancing in good order and in greater force than his reports had said, he began to retire by degrees towards the mountains,[2] in order that the Franks, supposing they had taken to flight, might pursue them with impetuosity, and breaking their order, might be more easily attacked. Finding that this manœuvre failed, the Turkish army was divided into two bodies, one of which advanced on the side towards the sea, while the other stood fast, hoping thus to place the Christians between them. But the Franks detached a body of troops from the division commanded by Duke Godfrey and Robert the Norman, thus forming an eighth division,

torians assert that the general was playing chess when the near approach of the Christian army was announced to him.

[1] Raymond d'Agiles and William of Tyre assign a more natural cause for this setting the dry grass on fire. According to them, the Mussulmans had recourse to this expedient without premeditation, and to stop the impetuous pursuit of the crusaders.

[2] The Black Mountains, according to William of Tyre, the Mount Pierius of the ancients, now called by the Arabs Gebel-el-Hamar (the Red Mountains). Seven rivulets or torrents take their rise in them, all of which discharge their waters into the Orontes. The mountains are situate one hour distant from Antioch.

which they placed under the command of one Rainald,[1] with directions to oppose the advance of the Pagans from the side towards the sea. These troops were instantly attacked by the Turks, and numbers of them fell by showers of arrows or by death cruelly inflicted in other ways. The other divisions of the Christian army extended their lines from the sea to the foot of the mountains, a space of about two miles.

The Turks charged them with vigour on both flanks, skilfully endeavouring to surround them and extend their attacks on all sides. But in this emergency, thanks be to God, there was seen to issue forth from the heart of the mountains, a countless host, mounted on white horses, and carrying white banners. This spectacle was witnessed by many of the Christians, and it is believed, of the Gentiles, who, in their first surprise, did not know what to make of it. At last, both parties became sensible that it was a manifestation from heaven, and recognized in the leaders of the celestial army the holy martyrs St. George, St. Demetrius, and St. Mercury,[2] marching at the head and carrying

[1] See just before p. 136, and the note. The Rainald here mentioned rather slightingly is the same person described in the former passage as "a valiant count"—the count de Toul. The author of the *History of the Holy War* has given the clearest account of this battle. He says: "The Turks were divided into two bodies; one went towards the sea, and the other stood firm, thinking to enclose our army between them. Then there was formed a seventh division from that of Duke Godfrey and the count of Normandy, and it was placed under the command of Count Rainald. This division was ordered to oppose the troops of the enemy advancing from the sea coast."

[2] These three saints belonged to the Eastern church.

St. George, of whose history there are few authentic remains, is supposed to have been a native of Lycia, and to have suffered martyrdom at Lydda, in Palestine, as we shall presently find, on the 23rd of April.

St. Demetrius is a name common to many Eastern saints; but the one here referred to was doubtless martyred at Thessalonica in the year 307—on the 8th of October, according to the Latins, but his feast is kept on the 26th of October by the Greeks and Russians.

These two saints are not only held in great veneration among the Oriental Christians, but by the Turks also, who keep their feasts, marking by the former their season of going to reside in the country, and by the latter that of their return to the towns, and affirming that both were Mussulmans.

St. Mercury, a soldier, suffered martyrdom at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, about the year 260, on the 25th of December.

Robert of St. Remi substitutes St. Maurice for St. Mercury, not very

their banners. At this sight the Saracens were struck with mortal terror, while the Christians were filled with confident hope. The prodigy was not seen by all, but it is attested by many who were eye-witnesses. It was a sign from heaven for the confusion of one party and portending the approaching triumph of the other.

The Gentiles who fought on the side towards the sea, finding they were unable to sustain the weight of the conflict, set fire to the grass as Curboran had ordered. This preconcerted signal being seen, those who were in the tents fled hastily and in confusion, snatching up in their alarm their most valuable effects. The Christians who fought on this side had already directed their attack to the Turkish camp, where they knew that their greatest force was stationed. The Turks still made all the resistance in their power, so that some fought while the rest were intent on pillaging the tents. Meanwhile, Duke Godfrey, with Robert of Flanders and Hugh the Great, made a charge with their cavalry near the river,[1] where they found that a great body of the enemy was again collected. Their joint attack repelled the pagans, although they made a stout resistance, and the battle raged desperately on both sides. The clang on brazen helmets was like the hammering of anvils. Sparks flew from the battered swords; skulls were cloven; and the ground was bespattered with the brains of the dead. Armour was broken, and men embowelled. The weary horses were covered with sweat, but there was no repose

happily, for the commander of the Theban legion is, from the place of his martyrdom, altogether a saint of the Western church (22nd of September). There were, however, two other saints of the name of Maurice in the East; St. Maurice of Nicopolis, 10th of July, and St. Maurice d'Apamea, 16th and 18th of July.

In the chronicle of Monte Cassino, St. Theodore (probably Stratelates, February 7) is substituted for St. Mercury, and the miracle is referred to the battle of Dorylœum. The *History of the Holy War* agrees with this, and also represents the three saints as having often appeared at the head of celestial warriors in the crusaders' battles, St. Mercury most frequently; St. George, also, on some occasions, and St. Theodore more rarely. The three latter are introduced by the author in his account of the battle of Antioch, to the exclusion of St. Demetrius.

[1] This movement was made in support of Bohemond and his corps de réserve, which was sharply attacked by the sultan of Damascus and the emir of Jerusalem, who had, as before observed, ascended the right bank of the Orontes to cut off the retreat of the Christians.

either for the horses or horsemen. The troops were engaged at such close quarters, that they were scarcely separated by the length of their weapons. Some fought hand to hand, foot to foot, and body against body. Meanwhile, a terror inspired by God himself seized the Turks, and the invincible constancy of their adversaries filled them with admiration and astonishment, and compelled them to retreat. The whole body began to give way, and neither trumpets, drums, nor clarions, nor the voice of heralds, could recall them to the ranks. The routed Turks made for their tents, where they expected to find a large body of troops, whom they had left there in reserve, but they had fled, as before related, as soon as the signal-fire was lit by the troops engaged. The Christians drove the pagans before them with great slaughter to the Iron Bridge, and pursued them sword-in-hand as far as Tancred's fort; they then returned to the enemy's tents, and pillaged everything they fancied. They carried back with them to the city in great triumph wealth of all kinds, woolled sheep, innumerable beasts of burden, plentiful stores of provisions, and whatever else could supply their necessities; for it is the custom of the pagans to carry with them in their expeditions abundant supplies, horses, asses, and camels for conveying baggage, sheep, and oxen for food, with corn, and meal, and lentiles, and oil, not forgetting wine. The Christians, having obtained with the wished-for victory these abundant stores of all descriptions, blessed God with due praises, acknowledging him as their present protector, and raising to heaven hymns of thanksgiving.

The Syrians and Armenians who inhabited that country, seeing that the Turks had sustained an irretrievable defeat, closed the well-known passes of the mountains, occupying the defiles, and sword-in-hand caused the fugitives great losses. They butchered them like lost sheep who in their fear could find no means of safety. The emir also who had remained in the citadel, the custody of which was committed to him by Curboran, seeing his friends shamefully routed in every quarter, was struck with terror, and consulting his own safety, before the Franks re-entered the city, asked for a Christian standard, which being given him, he planted it on the summit of the castle, that it might secure quarter to

himself and the garrison, there being no doubt as to the surrender of the citadel. The crusaders returning conquerors, when the Lombards[1] saw the pennon of the count of St. Giles, he being nearest at hand when a Christian ensign was demanded, they were much enraged, and began to utter violent threats. The emir, to allay the disturbance, sent back the count's pennon, and hoisted that of Bohemond on the tower,[2] for the peace and safety of himself and his comrades. Then the capitulation made between Bohemond and the emir was ratified by all, and the citadel was quickly surrendered to the Christians. Soon afterwards, the emir was baptized, as, according to his account, he had long desired, and received magnificent presents from the liberality of the Franks.

It was thus that the Christians, by God's help, gained the victory in the battle on the fourth of the calends of July [June 28th][3] and possessed Antioch in freedom and tranquillity. As for the Turks of the garrison who had surrendered the citadel but rejected the Christian faith, which is the light of the soul and the way of salvation, they returned to their own country, under the protection of Bohemond, according to the terms of their capitulation.

The Franks who formed their escort according to the treaty, having left them on their own frontiers to which the Turks were approaching unsuspicious of any danger, Baldwin suddenly set on them from Rages,[4] and attacking them in the Lord's name, overthrew the barbarians and put them nearly all to the sword. Then he led his followers laden with booty to Antioch, and announced this favourable intelligence to his friends.

[1] The inhabitants of the southern provinces of Italy, Apulia, and Calabria, who marched under the standard of Bohemond.

[2] Of the citadel. We shall find in the sequel that the count of Tholouse retained possession for a considerable time of the mosque he had fortified, as well as the palace of Bagui-Syan.

[3] The 28th of June, 1098.

[4] *Edessa* is the place meant. William of Tyre, as well as our author, has adopted this erroneous name. Most of the historians of the crusades call Edessa *Roais, Rhoa, Rhoas,* in which we recognize some remains of the name of *Callirhoe,* given it by Pliny on account of its beautiful fountain. The Turks now call it *Orfa.* It is situated to the N.E. of Antioch, at the distance of fifty-six hours' journey.

Having now an opportunity of relating what refers to Baldwin, it shall, in God's name, have a succinct place in the course of my narrative; for such considerable events ought not to be passed in silence.

CH. XI. *Baldwin's conquests in Armenia—Becomes duke or prince of Edessa—Elected king of Jerusalem, after his brother Godfrey's death—Succession of the crusaders, kings of Jerusalem.*

WHEN Baldwin, as before related, on Tancred's departure in disgust, had taken posession of Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, he left the army of his brother Godfrey and the other chiefs and marched in the direction of Edessa at the head of three hundred knights with their men-at-arms. On his arrival Baldwin offered the services of his followers to the free disposal of the govenor who commanded the Turks in that province.[1] That officer and his citizens received the Franks with great kindness, assigned them quarters in that wealthy place, furnished them with plentiful supplies of food, and good pay, and entrusted to them the defence of the whole country. Duke Godfrey and the other Christian chiefs, learning that Baldwin had the command of the duchy of Edessa, were highly pleased, and out of respect to him avoided entering on the borders of that province. Baldwin was a knight of great stature, of a noble presence, and lofty spirit, well imbued with letters, celebrated for his valour and worth, and of illustrious descent, as sprung from the race of the emperor Charlemagne.[2] This lord, with the inhabitants of Edessa, made frequent expeditions against the Turks in the neighbourhood, and defeating the pagans took much booty and many captives; thus making the duke of Edessa formidable to all his neighbours.

The city of which we are speaking is called by old writers Rages, but it was destroyed during the fierce wars waged between the ancient kings of the Assyrians and Chaldeans

[1] He was an old Greek, sent there in the reign of the emperor Romanus Diogenes (1068—1071), and who is called by Anna Commena, *Thoros*.

[2] See vol. ii. p. 12. It may be added that Maud of Louvaine, wife of Eustace I., count de Boulogne, through whom this descent is traced, had for her mother Gerberge of Lorraine, daughter of Charles, duke of Lorraine, brother of King Lothaire.

At a later age, Seleucus Nicanor, who was one of the four principal generals of Alexander the Great, after his death restored this city and called it Edessa. It is watered by the Tigris and Euphrates which are the sources of fertility and abundance to the natives. King Abgarus governed Edessa, the same to whom the Lord Jesus sent a sacred letter, and the precious napkin which had wiped the sweat from his brow and retained the Saviour's features miraculously impressed, so that the lineaments and proportions of the divine image were visible on it. Thaddeus, the disciple of Jesus Christ came to this city and baptising King Abgarus with all his people first established, by the grace of God, the worship of the divinity.[1] The community of this place was composed of Greeks, Armenians, and Syrians living together, and serving the King of heaven from the foundation of Christianity to the present day. But for their sins God had lately chastised them with the discipline of his rod, and caused the offences of the Christians to be punished by the fury of the Gentiles; so that the city, with the surrounding country was under the dominion of the Turks. They still freely attended divine worship, and were not compelled to abandon the law of God by any restriction of the pagans. The citizens of Edessa therefore were well pleased with the civilization of the Franks, who, on their part, treated them in all things as brothers.

The haughty governor of Edessa, moved by jealousy and blinded by malice, laid snares for the crusaders, commanding his officer, who was going on an expedition, to attack Baldwin and his companions, as they were returning and when they were unarmed, and to kill them without mercy. The treacherous contriver of this nefarious scheme took his measures accordingly, but the intelligence reached Baldwin's ears who was beloved by many. As they were returning from the expedition the pagans recommended the Christians, in light talk, to lay aside their armour, that they might be less incumbered; but they, aware of the plot, did not listen to the advice. At last, as they were drawing near to the city, the Franks riding in full armour, the Gentiles at a given signal suddenly threw themselves on them, and, thus assaulting their comrades, disclosed their base designs. The Christians,

[1] See vol. i. p. 263.

however, in the name of the Lord, stood firm, and attacking their enemies with spirit put them to flight, killing some as they were making their escape and pursuing the rest, sword in hand, to the city gate. Baldwin then ordered his people to pitch their tents on the spot, and lay siege to the place. A great commotion was now raised in the city, and the people flocked together from all quarters.

Then Tobias, the chief of the citizens, thus addressed them: "Good citizens, I beseech you to be quiet for a short time while I go with three of my neighbours to the Franks, and inquire for what reason they have laid siege to our city." In consequence the four principal citizens went out of the town, and inquired the cause of the sudden siege. Baldwin replied: "I left my brothers and friends, and the noble army of Christians, in Cilicia, and came here with three hundred gallant knights to enter your service, and I have been a faithful protector to you and your governor on all occasions. The crusaders, out of their regard for me have left the borders of your country untouched, and have done you no injury of any kind. I and my followers have engaged in sharp hostilities with your enemies in the neighbourhood, and gained frequent triumphs over them for your peace and security. You doubtless are sensible of this, and will, I think, bear witness to the truth of my assertions. What offence then have I and my companions given this day? Why, when we were returning in security to your city, as we did yesterday and often before, did our fellow soldiers suddenly attack us with swords and spears? In this emergency we resisted, calling on God according to the Christian practice, and Christ our God, who is always ready to help his servants, promptly gave the succour from heaven which we implored. Our comrades who attacked us as enemies felt the weight of our arms in defence of our own lives, and turned their backs and fled. Some of them, as you may perceive, were left by their companions dead on the road. These things being so, we remain in our tents, expecting your aid and advice; for we still regard you not as enemies, but as our loyal hosts."

Tobias, having heard this account and other similar details, called his neighbours apart, and after a brief conference returned to the Franks. "There is no need," he said, "illustrious knights, for many words; we entreat you to

wait for us here in peace, while we are employed in arranging your business satisfactorily in the city."

With these explanations, and a mutual understanding, the envoys re-entered the city, and reported to their neighbours what they had heard and said. The conduct of the four deputies was approved, and they were commissioned to present themselves at the governor's palace, while the rest of the citizens followed slowly under arms. They found the harsh governor alone in his private apartments, and saluting him in the fashion of the country, thus addressed him: "The times demand prudent counsel, for we have now reason to fear as enemies those whom we have hitherto considered as our faithful protectors. The Franks now besiege us closely, and are proceeding to assault us with the greatest vigour. They call us traitors, and summon us to judgment. They say that their fellow soldiers treacherously attacked them as they were returning from the enemy's country, and that they received more injury from their allies than from their adversaries. They, therefore, threaten us terribly that unless we render them justice they will bring upon us the whole force of the Christian army. We must, therefore, use prudent means for avoiding destruction, and take care that we do not provoke the intolerable wrath of the Christians by our injustice. The treasonable enterprise was undertaken without our knowledge, and so great a crime ought to be instantly punished. It is, therefore, the universal opinion of the citizens that the atrocious traitors should be dealt with according to the severity of our ancient laws, and that our illustrious friends, or rather protectors, should be respectfully conciliated."

While Tobias was thus speaking, a band of citizens had crept cautiously and silently into the palace. The pagan governor, however, treated with contempt the proposals of the friends, and plainly avowed himself the defender of the traitors and their fellow conspirators. Upon this, the incensed citizens rushed upon him, and, losing all respect, at once cut off his head.[1] Then Tobias took it, and said to

[1] This narrative of Baldwin's conquest of Armenia is not extracted from Balderic's history, like all the rest of our author's present book, nor even from that of Fulcher of Chartres, who, having followed the adventurous knight as far as Edessa in the capacity of chaplain, could have furnished

the citizens his neighbours: "Guard the palace, and all that it contains from injury; and I and my companions will bring hither the Franks with joy and peace." Saying this, Tobias went forth, and saluting the Franks, thus addressed them: "The citizens of Edessa, being greatly concerned at the injury done you, demanded redress from the governor. As, however, he avowed himself the author of the treason, they have cut off his head. See here the head of the enemy of God and of you, which they have sent by us." All present being filled with joy, Tobias added: "Come, illustrious knight, and receive the hand of the governor's daughter in marriage. Be our prince, and long may you possess the dukedom of Edessa." Baldwin, therefore, and his followers, entered the city in triumph, and were received in the palace of the government by all the citizens with great joy. In due time the beautiful daughter of the wicked governor was baptized, and married Baldwin the handsome knight, on whom she had secretly set her affections during her father's life, without his knowledge.[1] The native Christians were highly delighted to be under the government of a Christian prince, and returned thanks to God, while the Turks were dejected at losing their dominion over the worshippers of Christ, whom they had hitherto oppressed. The magnificent church of St. Sophia had been built at Edessa in ancient times, and under the rule of Baldwin, the faithful, both natives and foreigners, dedicated to St. Saviour, the virtue and wisdom of God the Father, and restored his worship. The order of divine service was re-established with much splendour at Edessa, and divine grace displayed its influence on the people both in their hearts and actions

our author with more precise information than that he has adopted. The reader will already have discovered that the account savours more of romance than of history. Unfortunately for the crusaders' fame, the governor was much more true to his engagements than Baldwin. The old prince having solemnly adopted him, with singular ceremonies, became the victim of a popular tumult, of which Baldwin was the hero, if not the contriver, and which, at least, he took no pains to repress.

[1] The new prince of Edessa did not marry his predecessor's daughter, but the niece of a chief of that country, whose name, it is said, was Taphroë. He divorced her, and married again in 1102, Adelaide, widow of Roger I., king of Sicily, whom he soon afterwards also repudiated upon the pretext of consanguinity.

much more wonderfully and incomparably than my pen can describe.

Baldwin, having been thus engaged in a multiplicity of affairs for the glory of Christ,[1] had not been able to assist the crusaders in the siege of Antioch. Hearing, however, reports of the extreme distress to which they were reduced, he and his companions deeply compassionated their sufferings, and as soon as it was in their power, put their affairs in order to hasten to their relief. Meanwhile, by the help of the Lord Jesus, they had gained a great victory over Curboran and his army, and Baldwin and his companions had cut off the Turks, who had retreated from the citadel of Antioch, as before mentioned, and taking their spoils, visited their brothers and friends. Then, all having mutually related their several successes, rejoiced together, and gave thanksgivings with heart and mouth to the God of victory, who ordereth all things well.

After this conference of the brothers and friends, Duke Baldwin returned to Rages, and took under his fatherly government the church of God and the people committed to his care. He defeated the Turks on his frontiers in frequent engagements, and crushing the wicked, enlarged the borders of the Christians. He also nobly increased the endowments of the clergy, furnished them with all that was necessary, and anxiously entreated them to celebrate daily service for the benefit of the faithful. He maintained himself vigorously in the dukedom five years.[2] He then succeeded his brother Godfrey in the kingdom of Jerusalem, which he governed nearly fifteen years,[3] signalizing his reign by many bold

[1] Much less for the interests of religion than of his own private ambition. So much so that the princes and prelates of the crusaders made in vain a solemn appeal to his religious professions and his oaths, in order to retain him under the banner of the cross.

[2] This calculation is evidently exaggerated. Baldwin's government at Edessa could not commence before the autumn of 1097. He was elected king of Jerusalem about the 18th of October, 1100, and crowned on Christmas Day, the same year.

[3] This reckoning is not more exact than the preceding. Baldwin did not defer urging in person his claims to the crown of Jerusalem until he heard the news of his election. He quitted Edessa, as early as the 2nd of October, 1100; "his grief for his brother's death was absorbed by his joy at being his heir," says his historian, Fulche rof Chartres. He was elected the 18th of the same month, crowned the 25th of December, as we have just remarked, and died in the beginning of April, 1118.

actions against the pagans. He had no offspring by the Turkish wife he married. In consequence he appointed his cousin Baldwin de Burg to be his successor in his duchy and kingdom.[1] Afterwards, Fulk, count of Anjou, went in pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and received the kingdom with the hand of Melisent, daughter of the second Baldwin, whom he married.[2]

CH. XII. *After the siege of Antioch, the crusaders rest during the summer — Several towns taken — The chiefs re-assemble — Description of Antioch — Bohemond and Raymond of Tholouse dispute the possession of it.*

IN the month of July, after having, by the grace of God, gained the victory, and established their authority in Antioch, the Christian chiefs held a council, and by common agreement commissioned Hugh the Great to proceed to the court of the emperor Alexius at Constantinople and offer him the immediate possession of the city which they had purchased for him at the cost of so much suffering, calling upon him at the same time to observe the terms of the treaty which he had sworn to on his part, viz., that he would resolutely accompany them in their march to Jerusalem. Hugh the Great departed on this mission; but although he had hitherto conducted himself with great ability during the crusade both in the field and in council, he was very deficient on this occasion, for, like the raven sent forth from the ark, he never fulfilled as he ought, his promise of returning again.[3]

After Hugh's departure, the chiefs held a council, in which they consulted together how they were to proceed in leading the people of God to Jerusalem. They said: "This people which has undergone great sufferings in their en-

[1] Baldwin de Burg, second son of Hugh, count of Rethel, was crowned king of Jerusalem on Easter day, 14th of April, 1118, and died the 21st of August, 1131. He was cousin-german of Guy Troussel by his mother, Melisent of Monteheri.

[2] Fulk of Anjou, fifth of that name, surnamed the Young, who married Melisent, daughter of Baldwin de Burg, was crowned king of Jerusalem the 14th of September, 1131. His first wife was Eremburge, countess of Mans, 1110—1126.

[3] According to Ralph of Caen, Hugh the Great had been wounded in the thigh, and went to Tarsus for the recovery of his health.

deavour to reach the sepulchre of the Lord their God at Jerusalem, now exhausted by many calamities, calls loudly upon us to hasten the march, and we ourselves are weary of disappointment, and join our complaints to theirs. Let us therefore take the course most convenient for them, and submit to no further delays but such as are occasioned by necessity. At the same time, everything must be calculated with prudence and discretion. The country through which we have to pass is burnt up; the summer heat is excessive; and at this season it would be impossible for us to bear the torrid atmosphere. Besides, both our strength and our supplies are exhausted by a long siege. Let us therefore be quiet and seek repose, endeavouring to restore our sick and wounded, and not forgetting the relief of the poor. Let us wait for the rains of autumn, and avoid the injurious influences of the Cancer and the Lion. In the month of November the climate will be refreshed, and we will then re-assemble, and with one accord proceed on our journey: otherwise, the whole people will be prostrated with the intolerable heat. Let this counsel be well considered by the crowd who are agitating for our immediate departure. Necessity requires that we should defer it during this intractable season: and this course seems most advisable for all parties." The determination was announced to the whole army, and in the end it met with universal approbation.

The chiefs, therefore, with their household troops, dispersed themselves throughout the neighbouring country to pass the summer;[1] and the poor followed them to obtain subsistence: for the chiefs had said, "If there be any in want, or infirm health, let them attach themselves to our families, and we will support them, allowing them pay. The disabled shall be maintained at the public expense until they recover."

Then Raymond Pilet, a brave knight, one of the com-

[1] The chiefs of the crusaders quitted Antioch not only to pass the intense heats of summer in the cooler climate of the neighbouring mountains, but also to escape from the pestilential atmosphere generated by the decay of so many corpses in the close and heated city, from which constitutions already shattered by privations and excesses were exposed to so much injury. The women were particularly subject to these disorders, which, according to William of Tyre, carried off fifty thousand souls.

panions of the count of St. Giles, collected a body of horse and foot-soldiers, and putting himself at their head, and boldly entering the country of the Saracens passed beyond two cities to a strong place belonging to the Syrians called Talamania.[1] The inhabitants submitted voluntarily to the Franks, who rested there nearly eight days.

Then, again buckliug on their armour, they attacked a castle of the Agarenes in that neighbourhood, and having blockaded it till it surrendered, it was sacked and the natives put to the sword, except those who were willing to become Christians; those were preserved uninjured. After this, they returned to Talamania, rejoicing at their success. Three days afterwards they made another expedition against Marrah, a neighbouring town.[2] From thence many pagans who had assembled from Aleppo and other neighbouring places, issued forth to attack them. The Franks supposing that they were going to fight drew up in order like disciplined soldiers, but their hopes were disappointed. For the Turks cautiously retreated towards the city, neither flying before the enemy, nor suffering them to come to close quarters; but withdrawing a little from the conflict by a skilful manœuvre, they turned and again made a rapid charge on the Franks and then wheeling their horses round again retreated. The Franks had to sustain repeated attacks of this kind, nor could they safely disengage themselves from the enemy. For if they attempted to retreat the gentiles pressed on their rear, as afterwards happened. They had to maintain their ground, suffering from intolerable thirst, until the evening; for the heat was excessive. At last, being no longer able to bear the fatigue, and having no means of assuaging their thirst, for no water was to be found, they resolved to draw off in a body, and by a slow march, to their own castle. But the foot-soldiers and Syrians, feeble and undisciplined troops, breaking their ranks, regardless of the commands of the knights, were seized with a panic and began to fly in utter confusion. The pagans were instantly upon them when they gave way, and cut them down without mercy, fiercer than wolves, and

[1] M. Poujoulat thinks that this place must be in the neighbourhood of Mount Amanus, as its name indicates—*Tel-Amania*.

[2] Marrah, between Hamath and Aleppo.

giving no quarter. The prospect of victory, and the advantage they had gained supplied them with strength. Many therefore of the common people and faint-hearted were here slain, others were choked with thirst. Those who escaped alive returned with Raymond to Talamania, where they passed some days. This massacre took place in the month of July, and the insolence of the proud was thus punished by the hand of God. So we read in the sacred writings that the children of Israel were often afflicted, and defeated in battle by the Philistines, Edom, Midian, and other neighbouring nations, in order to compel them to return frequently to the Lord, and to persevere in the ways of his commandments.

At this time Aimar, bishop of Puy, fell sick at Antioch, and having comforted his sorrowing children with paternal affection went the way of all flesh, departing in the Lord on the calends of August [5th July]. His death caused deep affliction among the soldiers of the cross, for he was the counsellor of the nobles, the hope of the orphan, the protector of the weak, the companion in arms of the knights. The clergy he instructed and guided in a becoming manner; he was distinguished by his singular prudence, while his good humour and affability made him a general favourite. The whole army therefore celebrated his obsequies with much lamentation; his body was embalmed with aromatic spices and interred in the church of St. Peter the Apostle.

The count of St. Giles, who never yielded to sloth or idleness, when the Gentiles could be attacked with vigour, lost no time in making an irruption into the territory of the Saracens, and assaulted and took by storm a fine city of theirs called Albara.[1] He put to the sword almost all the inhabit-

[1] Raymond d'Agiles calls it *Barra*, and the oriental historians Baré or Elbarié. It was in the neighbourhood of this place and Marrah that the crusaders saw for the first time fields planted with sugar-canes. The passage of Albert d'Aix, describing their cultivation and use, is curious, and worth attempting to translate.

The inhabitants suck the sweet canes which grow freely on the level plains, and are called ZUCRA, *and so much enjoy the delicious juice, that they scarcely wait till they are ripe to revel in their luscious flavour. This kind of produce is cultivated by the country people every year with great industry. At the time of harvest, the canes are bruised in mortars, and the thick syrup is collected, and suffered to stand in vessels until it*

ants of both sexes and took the place into his own hands. The Christians appointed a bishop there, fitted for his office, and instituted what was required for the worship of the true faith. The bishop of Albara was sent to Antioch, and there duly consecrated according to the rites of the church.[1]

As the appointed time approached for resuming the journey to Jerusalem,[2] all the chiefs assembled at Antioch to consider this urgent business, so that they might be no longer diverted from their expedition. But there was an implacable quarrel concerning the possession of the city, between Duke Bohemond, and Count Raymond which all the ability of the elder chiefs failed in settling, notwithstanding their many sensible exhortations. The one demanded the sovereignty of the whole city, as it was promised to him during the siege and before it was taken. The other alleged the oath of fealty taken to the emperor, with Bohemond's approbation, and declared that he could not be absolved from it without perjury. Bohemond put the citadel which was given up to him in a state of defence, drawing in supplies of arms and provisions, and manning it with troops and warders. In like manner the count strengthened himself in the possession of the palace of the emir Cassian, which he had before occupied, and seized the fort at the bridge towards the port of St. Simeon. Their ambition and resentment were carried to such a pitch that neither of them would yield to the other, and both under colourable pretences aspired to the possession of the city.

It was not to be wondered at either as respected the

coagulates and hardens like snow or white salt. When grated, it is mixed with their drink, or dissolved in water, is used to sweeten pottage, being more wholesome and pleasant to the taste than honey itself. Some say that this was the kind of honey which Jonathan, the son of King Saul, found upon the ground, and dared to eat against the king's command. 1 Sam. xiv. 25—43. *The crusaders were much refreshed, after their severe sufferings from famine, by sucking these sweet canes during the sieges of Albara, Marrah, an dArchas.*

[1] This bishop's name was Peter. He was a native of Narbonne, and was consecrated by John IV., the Greek patriarch of Antioch, who had been very ill-used by the Turks during the siege, and, who soon after the city was taken, not being able to agree with the Latin Christians, retired to Constantinople.

[2] November 1.

honour or the profit of the acquisition; for Antioch is a very beautiful and strongly fortified place, and has rich and ample revenues. Within the city are inclosed four gentle hills, on the highest of which stands the citadel commanding the whole place.[1] The lower part of the town is well built, and it is surrounded by a double wall. The inner wall is broad and lofty, and formed of immense blocks of stone, squared and closely fitted. It has in its circuit four hundred and fifty towers,[2] the walls of which are of stately architecture and defended by battlements. The outer wall is not so lofty, but is a work of wonderful beauty. The city contains three hundred and forty churches,[3] and being a great primacy, is the seat of a patriarch who has one hundred and fifty three bishops under his jurisdiction. Antioch is shut in on the east by four hills,[4] and the river Farfar washes the walls on the west.[5] Its ancient name was Reblath,[6] as St. Jerome informs us in his Commentary on the Prophets, but it was afterwards augmented by Seleucus Nicanor, who called it after his father Antiochus Clarus. The place being of so much importance and dignity, as in truth the capital and metropolis of all Syria, the Franks were unwilling to part with it easily now that it was in their power, hoping by holding possession of it to extend their influence far and wide, and to reduce even distant regions to obedience to Christianity. The siege had lasted eight months and a day,[7] and

[1] This description is very exact; the four rising grounds of which our author speaks are inclosed within the walls, and the one on which the citadel is built is the last but one in going from west to east.

[2] William of Tyre only reckons three hundred and twenty. According to M. Poujoulat, there were in all one hundred and thirty, fifty-two of which are still in tolerably good preservation. The walls were all crenelled, and an Arabian writer says that 80,000 crenelles could be counted. The modern city of Antaki does not cover a sixth part of the ancient inclosure. To give an idea of its extent it is only necessary to mention that Antaki is more than an hour's walk from the gate of St. Paul.

[3] Peter of Tudebode reckons twelve hundred churches, and three hundred and sixty monasteries.

[4] These hills lie to the south rather than the east of the city.

[5] Read "the Orontes," which according to Fulcher of Chartres and William of Tyre was called at this time *Fern* or *Fer* by the natives.

[6] There seems no authority for Antioch's being identified with this ancient name, as St. Jerome supposed.

[7] Our author is not very fortunate in his chronological computations.

after its capture they had themselves been besieged within it three weeks. During the continuance of which siege there was so great a conflux of the Gentiles, that no one remembered having seen or heard of such an assemblage of nations. The crusaders rested at Antioch five months and nine days.[1] They were unwilling to relinquish their conquest for the many important reasons assigned, they therefore entrusted it to safe custody. Meanwhile the count and Bohemond had each their own private views regarding it. They therefore fortified the place, as before mentioned, and in the month of November,[2] proposed to undertake further enterprises, and having put things at Antioch in some sort of order, they both marched out of the place.

Ch. XIII. *The town of Marrah taken by Count Raymond and Bohemond—The crusaders suffer from famine—The chiefs return to Antioch.*

Count Raymond put himself at the head of his troops, and quitting Antioch, and passing through Rugia[3] and Albara, arrived on the fifth of the calends of December [November 27][4] before Marrah, a wealthy and strongly fortified town, containing a numerous population of Agarenes.[5] The next day he led his troops to the assault of the place, but as the walls were strong and well defended, he could make no impression at that time. Bohemond followed the count from Antioch on Sunday [the 28th November], and

This is much too high; from October 18 to June 3, there are only seven months and seventeen days.

[1] This calculation is not more exact than the last. From June 18 to November 11, a period during which the crusaders appear to have partially at least retired to the country, there are only four months and thirteen days. To make up the author's reckoning there must be included in the time of rest not only the twenty-four days of the blockade, but also that of the battle of Antioch.

[2] November 11, according to some accounts.

[3] On the subject of this place, see before p. 106. M. Pojoulat was not able to obtain any information respecting the site and the present state of Albara.

[4] On Saturday, November 17. He left Antioch on the 23rd.

[5] Marrah, a town some hours to the N.E. of Apamea, has now a population of five or six thousand souls.

also arrived before Marrah.[1] A second attack was then made by the united forces of the two chiefs, who repeatedly assaulted the defenders of the fortifications with great spirit but little success. Scaling-ladders were raised against the walls, but the violent outcries and threatening demonstrations of the Turks discouraged every one from venturing to mount them. The citizens indeed thought that their resistance on the present occasion would be as successful as it had been against Raymond Pilet; but Count Raymond caused a machine to be built of wood, to run on four wheels, that it might be easily moved. It was so lofty that it commanded the walls and reached to the battlements of the towers. This structure was rolled forward against one of the towers; the trumpets and clarions sounded, and the troops under arms invested the whole circuit of the walls, the cross-bowmen and archers discharged their bolts, and the party in the wooden tower hurled below immense stones, while the priests and clerks offered earnest prayers to the Lord for his people. William of Montpellier and many others fought from the machine, overwhelming the citizens beneath with stones and darts, and easily killed them by crushing their shields, helmets, and heads;[2] others made incessant attacks on the defenders of the walls with iron hooks. On the other hand, the Turks directed their arrows and missiles against the Christians from the towers, they also threw the Greek fire into the machine, and left nothing untried. The Christians lost no time in using oil to extinguish the fire;[3] and pressing forward to mount the walls, were driven back and held in check by those who manned the battlements, but still would not draw off. The

[1] Not only Bohemond, but a considerable part of the Christian army took part in the siege of Marrah.

[2] The description of this assault by Peter Tudebode is very curious; we can only quote one passage: "They so hammered the enemy on their shields that shields and pagans fell together into the city of the dead." The oriental historians assert that the count of Tholouse promised to spare the lives of the citizens, and that twenty thousand souls were victims of his breach of faith. According to the story told by the Latin writers, it must rather be imputed to Bohemond.

[3] It is manifestly impossible that so combustible a matter as oil should have been employed to extinguish the Greek fire. Our author has copied the error from his habitual guide Balderic, in whose account only it is to be found.

struggle was prolonged until the evening. The unwearied courage of the Agarenes foiled all the devices of the Christians. At length Gouffier de Tours,[1] a knight of the Limousin, of high birth and extraordinary daring, was the first to mount the scaling-ladder and reached the top of the wall. Some soldiers, few in number, ascended after him, for the ladder was broken and fell in pieces. Gouffier, however, held his footing on the battlements manfully, driving back the Pagans, and at the same time calling his comrades to his aid, both by his gestures and voice. They soon raised another scaling-ladder, by means of which so many knights and soldiers mounted to the top that they occupied a long extent of the wall, from which they entirely drove the garrison. The Pagans now rallied, and renewed the attack with so much determination, sometimes charging the Franks with such impetuosity, that some of them in their terror leaped from the wall. However, a strong body maintained their ground, and resisted the repeated attacks of the enemy, until the Christians below had undermined the wall and made a breach for the besiegers to enter. The Turks discovering this abandoned themselves to despair, and precipitately fled. Thus the wealthy town of Marrah was taken the evening of Saturday the ides[2] [the 11th] of December. The Christians spread themselves through the conquered place, and mercilessly pillaged it of all the wealth they could find in the houses and cellars, giving no quarter to the Saracens, but putting them almost all to the sword. Every place in the city was filled with corpses, and it was impossible to walk through the streets without stumbling over heaps of the dead. On the capture of the place a great number of the citizens, with their wives and children and most valuable effects, assembled in the palace over the gate, where they submitted to the Christians. Some of these were put to death, others, by Bohemond's order, were conducted to Antioch, and subjected to servitude or sold into

[1] Gouffiers de Lastours, lord of Hautefort and father of Guy de Lastours, who married Matilda, daughter of Geoffrey II., count de Perche, and widow of Raymond, viscount de Turnenne. The history of the first crusade by Gregory Buhade, a vassal of this Gouffiers de Lastours, who employed twelve years in composing it in the language of the country, is unfortunately lost.

[2] The reading should be "the third of the ides," that is, December 11.

slavery, and all were stripped of their wealth and scattered. The Franks remained at Marrah an entire month and three days.

The bishop of Orange fell sick there, and his spirit, released from the body, ascended to heaven.[1] A severe famine also affected the army, and forced some of them to devour things disgusting, unusual, disagreeable, and even forbidden. Some, indeed, partook of the flesh of the Turks,[2] which, coming to the knowledge of the elders and better sort, they were overwhelmed with shame and sorrow, but they suspended the punishment on account of the extremity of the famine. Nor did they esteem it a mortal offence that those who underwent voluntarily such excessive hunger for the cause of God should thus make war on the Turks with their teeth as well as their hands. The thing, indeed, was against all laws, but it was absolute necessity which drove them to it. When there is a famine in a camp, everything is welcome, nothing rejected. Some ripped open the bowels of the Turks to find the bezants and gold they had swallowed, and which they thus secured. Numbers perished by the prevalence of the famine.

The chiefs, while they were at Marrah, made fresh endeavours to restore amity between the duke and the count, but their efforts were fruitless. In consequence, Bohemond was so much irritated that he immediately went back to Antioch,[3] and the expedition to Jerusalem was hindered, to the great injury of the people. The private quarrels and animosities of princes disturb and afflict their subjects; for while every one is seeking his own advantage, he is careless of the common good; and the people fall into ruin when their chiefs do not protect them. The army of Jerusalem

[1] William, the first of the name, bishop of Orange and vice-legate; he died December 2.

[2] These accounts are confirmed by the contemporary historians of the crusade, who supply details even more disgusting. The famine appears to have been caused by excessive rains which interrupted the communications, and caused all the provisions to rot.

[3] Not only Bohemond, but Godfrey and the count of Flanders also, returned to Antioch. After the conference at Rugia, Godfrey took advantage of this season of leisure to pay his brother Baldwin a visit at Edessa.

was much embarrassed by the personal quarrels of their chiefs.

CH. XIV. *Reconciliation of the chiefs—March of the crusaders by the sea-coast to Jerusalem—Towns captured or surrendered—Arrive under the walls of the holy city.*

COUNT RAYMOND again sent envoys to the chiefs at Antioch and invited them to meet him at Rugia to have another conference. In consequence, Duke Godfrey, with Robert the Norman, and Robert of Flanders, and other chiefs who were summoned, proceeded to Rugia, taking Bohemond with them. Much was then said on the necessity of restoring concord among the principal nobles, but no means of accomplishing it was discovered. Bohemond refused to march on Jerusalem unless Antioch was entirely given up to him, and the count would not go unless Bohemond accompanied the rest. Raymond returned to Marrah where the Christian army was in danger of perishing by famine.[1] At length, in the compunction of his heart, a generous feeling prevailed, and, to serve the soldiers of Christ, he undertook to prosecute the journey to Jerusalem, preferring the cause of God to his own will and profit. To subdue themselves is the highest virtue of which princes are capable; in general, they exhibit great obstinacy, and cause their subjects extreme perils. The count ruled his own spirit that he might not injure all Christendom. However, he gave orders to his people to maintain a strong garrison in the palace of Cassian.[2]

Count Raymond came out of Marrah on the ides [13th] of January,[3] and, with bare feet, freely joined the Christian pilgrims, exhibiting by this token of humility his resumption of the pilgrimage. There was, therefore, great

[1] During the absence of the count of Tholouse, the crusaders whom he left at Marrah, exasperated at the chief's delay in leading them to Jerusalem, destroyed the walls of the place.

[2] This direction shows that the count's repentance was far from sincere. Not only the palace of the emir, Bagui-Syan, but also the fortified mosque at the end of the bridge of Antioch, were recommended to the vigilant care of his retainers. Bohemond seized the opportunity of Godfrey's absence to get possession of the latter, and as to the former, Tancred, in a fit of ill-humour with the count, came express from Marrah to seize it and deliver it up to Bohemond. See Ralph de Caen (xcviii).

[3] January 13, 1099.

joy among the people of God, and the duke of Normandy joined them on their march at the city of Capharda.[1] There they rested three days, and the king of Cæsarea made an alliance with the chiefs. He had already sent frequent messages to Marrah, firmly promising to keep the peace towards the Christians, and furnish them gratuitously with many things they wanted, as well as to allow them free trade through all his dominions, if only the invincible Franks abstained from invading his dominions, and devastating his territories. In that case, he swore fealty to the Christians. The whole army now marched from Capharda, and encamped on this side the river Farfar, near Cæsarea.[2] The king, seeing the Franks stationed so near his city, was much troubled, and immediately sent them this message: "Unless you remove your camp from the suburbs of our city at the first dawn of day, you will violate our treaty, we shall forbid the traffic for supplies, and take precautions for our own safety." Accordingly, as soon as it was morning, he sent two of his people to the Christians to show them where they could ford the river, and to conduct the army into a fertile district. They entered a rich and fruitful valley, commanded by a castle which formed immediately a post of security for the chiefs. The army laid hands on as many as five thousand cattle, and great abundance of provisions of all descriptions were found; so that all the soldiers of Christ were refreshed by the gratuitous plenty. The garrison also gave them horses, and pure gold, and much money, and swore that they would never more molest the pilgrims, nor prohibit their trafficking with the people of the country. They rested there five days.

Departing from thence, they came to a camp of the Arabs, the chief of whom came forth to talk with the Christians,

[1] According to the careful Raymond d'Agiles, this place, which appears from the researches of M. Poujoulat to be no longer in existence, was only four leagues from Marrah, probably near the Orontes. It is mentioned in the history of the wars of Antioch by Walter the chancellor. M. Poujoulat points out between Lattakia and Aleppo the fortified post of Gafar, a corresponding name; but the distance from Marrah seems to preclude its being Capharda.

[2] This could not be Cæsarea in Palestine, situated between St. Jean d'Acre and Jaffa, but another town of the same name on the banks of the Orontes, between Apamea and Emessa.

and made a peace with them to the satisfaction of both parties. They then journeyed to the city of Cephalia,[1] which stands in a valley, and is surrounded with stately walls, and rich in all kinds of commodities. The citizens were struck with alarm at the approach of the Franks, and deserted the place in a panic, leaving their gardens well stocked with vegetables, and their houses stored with provisions and all kinds of useful articles, without staying to look behind them. The Christians took possession of their substance in triumph, rendering grateful thanks to God, the Giver of all good. They marched forward on the third day, and, crossing a high mountain by a precipitous road, descended into another rich valley,[2] where they rested twelve days. While there they made a vigorous assault on a fortified place belonging to the Saracens, which stood in the neighbourhood of the valley, and would have stormed it if the Gentiles had not driven out to them herds of cattle and beasts of burden, which the Christians carried off, and thus returned to their camp encumbered with the spoil. The Pagans, however, had been so terrified that they retired in the night, and at dawn of day the Franks discovered that the fort was deserted and took possession of it. They found in it plentiful stores of corn and wine, meal, barley, and oil, and they spent there the feast of the Purification of St. Mary with great devotion.

While there, the chiefs received rich presents from the king of the city of Camela,[3] who offered to make peace with the Christians, promising that he would never molest them, but rather love and honour them, if the Christian army treated him in like manner.

The king of Tripoli[4] also sent ten horses and four mules with a large sum of gold to the Christians, and demanded by his envoys peace and amity with them. But the chiefs would neither make peace with him, nor receive his presents,

[1] No remains of this place now exist.

[2] The valley of Lem, or as some authors write it, Sem. Ordericus places it in the neighbourhood of Tripoli, as we shall presently see.

[3] Emessa, now Heems, on the right bank of the Orontes, on the other side Mont Lebanon, and under nearly the same latitude as Tripoli in Syria and Palmyra.

[4] Tripoli of Syria, now called Tarabolos, between Botrys and Archis.

on the contrary they boldly replied, "We reject all that comes from you until you consent to become a Christian." After leaving the rich valley, they came to a castle called Archis,[1] near which they encamped on the day before the ides [the 12th] of February.[2] The place was strongly occupied by a vast number of Pagans, and frequented by hordes of Arabs and Publicans, who defended themselves bravely against the assaults of the Christians. Fourteen Christian knights sallied forth on the road to Tripoli, which was at no great distance from the camp, and fell in with sixty Turks, who were convoying a large body of men, Saracens, Arabs, and Curds, to the number of about one thousand and five hundred, with vast herds of cattle. The Christian knights charged the Turks with spirit and killing six of them took their horses, and dispersed all the rest of the convoy and brought back the cattle to the camp. Thus the invincible bravery of the Franks quelled the courage of all the people of the country both far and near, God thus working in them, who is always at hand to succour his champions. It was owing to the power of God such success attended his servants, that fourteen Christians defeated sixty Turks, and dispersed the rest of the multitude carrying off the cattle from before their faces.

Raymond Pilet, and Raymond the viscount,[3] with a few other knights attached to the division of Raymond, count of Tholouse, went on an expedition towards the city of Tortosa,[4] where a considerable number of Pagans were collected. It being late, they chose a retired spot for passing the night in security, and lit a number of fires as if the whole army was present. At sunrise the Franks mustered to attack the city, but found it deserted, and

[1] Archis, or Arachis, between Tripoli and Tortosa.

[2] On Saturday, February 12, according to our author; but it appears that it was really on Monday the 14th.

[3] It is thought that Raymond Pilet was lord of Alais; as for the other person described as "the viscount," and who is called by other writers *vicecomes de Tentoria* or *Centoria*, seems to be a mistake of the copyists, and that the person meant is Raymond, viscount de Turenne, first husband of Matilda, daughter of Geoffrey II., count de Perche.

[4] Tortosa, the ancient Antarudos, between Tripoli and Lattakia. Since they left Cæsarea, the crusaders' march had continually retrograded towards the north and Antioch.

quartered themselves in it while they besieged the citadel.

The emir of the city of Maraclea,[1] which was at no great distance, made peace with the Christians and planted their ensigns on the walls of the city. Meanwhile, Duke Godfrey and the count of Flanders and Bohemond came as far as Laodicea,[2] which is commonly called Licea. Bohemond however again parting from them, returned to Antioch, which he greatly desired to possess. The duke and the count were besieging the city of Gibel,[3] when Count Raymond received intelligence,[4] that the Gentiles were at hand in great force, and the Christians were threatened with a desperate battle. He therefore sent this message to his allies who were besieging Gibel: "A battle is certainly impending, the Pagan army is marching against us. We wish you therefore to make peace with the city you are besieging, and to hasten to the assistance of your brethren in arms. It is better to unite and conquer than to be divided and subdued. Battle makes short work, and the gain of the victors is great; while sieges waste much time, and fortified places are not easily reduced. Battles place

[1] Now Marakia, between Tortosa and Lattakia. The crusaders still continued their retrograde movement towards Antioch, probably to meet the chiefs who remained there, and to whom Arnold, the duke of Normandy's chaplain, had been sent on a mission to prevail on them to join the army and make a combined movement on Jerusalem.

[2] Laodicea, now Lattakia, twenty-six hours' journey to the S.W. of Antioch. Here Godfrey and the count of Flanders, who accompanied Bohemond from Antioch, parted from him to continue their route towards Jerusalem, while he retraced his steps to his capital. Laodicea had been taken and sacked by a fleet of twenty-two vessels, containing adventurers from Flanders and Boulogne, before the arrival of the crusaders under the walls of Antioch.

[3] The ancient Gabala, now Djebali, between Lattakia and Marakia.

[4] It would have been more correct if our author had, instead of *audivit*, written *finxit se audivisse;* he "pretended to have received intelligence." It is not one of the most honourable traits in the character of the count of Tholouse, but it must not be disguised that it is an established fact that this rigid stickler for good faith, who was ever ready to remind Bohemond, even unseasonably, of his engagements to the Greek emperor, was prevailed on by the gifts presented him by the inhabitants of Djebali to draw off Godfrey and the count of Flanders from attacking their city by the alarm of an imaginary danger. Albert d'Alais gives the details of this false alarm.

nations and kingdoms at our feet. Enemies conquered in war disappear like smoke. When the war is ended and the enemy defeated, a vast empire will be open to us. It is expedient therefore that we join our forces, for if we may hope to have God for our leader and guide, we shall certainly triumph over our enemies in a short time. Hasten therefore, that our adversaries on their arrival may not find us unprepared."

The duke and the count received this message with great satisfaction, as they were eager for battle. They therefore made peace with the emir of Gibel, and received from him at the conclusion of the treaty many presents. They then marched to the aid of their comrades, but did not find the Turks as they expected. They therefore established themselves on the other side of the river, and laid siege to the castle. Shortly afterwards, some of the Christian horsemen rode as far as Tripoli, looking for an opportunity of annoying the Gentiles. They found some Turks and Arabians, with some of the people of Tripoli, riding about outside the town waiting the approach of the Christians, and intending to take them by surprise. Presently the squadrons charged each other; the Saracens stood their ground fairly at the first onset, and resisted for a time; at last however they turned their backs and fled before the swords of the enemy, and lost many of their party in the retreat; several of the principal citizens fell there. The women, both mothers and virgins, watching the conflict from the battlements, poured forth imprecations on the Christians, and cries of anguish for their friends. But in the midst of their grief, some of them could not help admiring the valour of the Franks. The river which washes the city was coloured red by the blood of the Pagans who were slain, and the cisterns fed by its stream in the heart of the city were polluted by the carnage. The distress of the people of Tripoli was extreme, as well for the loss of their principal citizens, as for their cisterns, the waters of which were spoilt by the effusion of blood. Thus they suffered two disasters on the same day, and their tears flowed for a double misfortune. They were in despair that the Franks had unexpectedly triumphed, and were troubled at the pollution of the cisterns they valued very highly. The people of Tripoli were therefore utterly

disheartened, and shutting themselves up within their walls before they were besieged, did not venture any longer outside the gates; their neighbours were partakers in their misfortunes. The Franks, having obtained a welcome victory, returned to their friends, giving praises to God.

Another day, a detachment of cavalry made an irruption into the valley of Sem[1] to plunder the country, and sweeping off oxen and asses, sheep and camels, to the number of nearly three thousand, they returned triumphant to the camp with this great booty. The crusaders were detained before the castle of Archis three months and a day,[2] for it was almost impregnable. They celebrated there the feast of Easter, on the fourth of the ides [the 10th] of April. Meanwhile, some Christian ships had anchored in a port near the castle, which was a safe harbour, and they were freighted with corn and wine, cheese and oil, lentils and lard, and all sorts of merchandise for the use of the army. The troops also made frequent expeditions to ravage the country, and never failing of success, they returned in high spirits and eager for fresh incursions.[3] However, many of the Christians fell before the place, for the swords of the Saracens were not always in their scabbards, nor their chivalry idle, nor their arms weak. Thus they slew Anselm de Ribmont,[4] and William Picard, men of high birth and experience in military affairs, who had signalized themselves by great achievements during that crusade. Many others also fell, whose names may God record in his book of life.

[1] See before, p. 161. This valley, the name of which is differently written in the accounts of the first crusade, Lem, Sem, and Issem, is mentioned by almost all the historians.

[2] From February 14 or 15 to May 13.

[3] According to our author, the camp of the Christians must have been plentifully supplied during the siege of Archis, while so far from that being the case, they were exposed to the severest privations. He also omits the trial by hot iron to which the discoverer of the holy lance submitted on April 25, which ended in his death.

[4] Anselm, count de Ribemont (Aisne), of the family of the ancient counts of Valenciennes, and an historian of the first crusade. Unfortunately we have only one of his narratives, that which gives an account of the capture of Antioch, and the events which immediately succeeded. It is printed in d'Acheri's *Spicilegium*. In the sequel we shall find Agnes, the sister of this excellent nobleman, marrying Walter Giffard, earl of Buckingham, and scandalizing all Normandy by her adulterous connection with Duke Robert Curthose.

The king of Tripoli had frequent communications with the Christian chiefs by means of his envoys, and used every argument to persuade them to accept his presents and make peace with him, breaking up their camp and receiving the money agreed on. The crusaders proposed to him to embrace Christianity, and would not be diverted from their purpose by any other consideration. The prince heard of this change of religion with extreme repugnance, for he shrunk from relinquishing the rites of his fathers and the customs of his ancestors. Meanwhile, time wearing on, the new corn began to be white for harvest, for the climate of that country is much warmer than it is on this side the mountains, and the summer being earlier, the corn sooner ripens. New beans are gathered in the middle of March, wheat is cut by the ides [the 13th] of April, and the vintage is finished before autumn.

In consequence, Duke Godfrey, and the counts of Normandy, Flanders, and Tholouse, with Tancred, held consultations respecting their departure, because the favourable season was pressing on, if not almost past. Raising therefore the siege of the castle which they had long invested, they marched to Tripoli,[1] and concluded a treaty of peace with the inhabitants. The king delivered to them fifteen thousand bezants and fifteen horses of great value, with three hundred pilgrims he had long retained in captivity. Peace being made,[2] and the markets opened, the strength of the Christians was universally re-established. The king also promised them that if they were successful in the battle which the emir of Babylon was then preparing to fight with them, he would become Christian, and, for the rest, would hold his territories under fealty to the chiefs.

The crusaders quitted Tripoli in the middle of May,[3] and marching all day through a mountainous country by narrow passages and difficult roads, arrived late in the

[1] They arrived there on Friday, May 13.

[2] The emir of Tripoli was defeated in a bloody battle before he consented to these conditions.

[3] Peter Tudebode and Guibert de Nogent mention Friday, May 13, as the day of their arrival, and Monday the 16th as that of their departure. These dates are preferable to those supplied by Robert de St. Remi and others.

evening at the castle of Betheren.[1] Thence they came to Zebari,[2] a town lying on the sea-coast. Here they suffered excessive thirst for want of water, fainting for which they hastened forward to the river Braim,[3] where men and beasts refreshed themselves with abundant draughts. On Ascension-day[4] they had to thread a narrow defile, where they were exposed to the attacks of the Gentiles during the entire march, but they were not deterred from the attempt. The standard-bearers and men-at-arms rode in the van, looking out carefully against ambuscades; next came those who had the care of the baggage and the drivers of the beasts of burden. The rear was brought up by a body of knights ready to give succour whenever it was needed. Thus the loaded attendants proceeded daily, and crowds of unarmed people were mingled with them. The trumpets sounded from time to time, and they marched slowly that the weak might not be left behind. They took it by turns to mount guard by night, and when there was especial cause of alarm, the watch was more on the alert: nothing was done indiscreetly or in disorder. Breaches of discipline were punished; the inexperienced were taught; the insubordinate were reproved; the intemperate were restrained; and all were encouraged to make charitable offerings. The practice of frugality and propriety was universal; and, in a word, the camp was a school of moral discipline. Such were the habits and dispositions of the pilgrims to Jerusalem; and as long as they observed these strict rules, and displayed their charitable feelings, God was evidently with them, and made them champions in his wars. I have given this account to compare it with the way of life, so worthy of reproach, of those disorderly persons who, full of vain-glory, followed in the track of this glorious expedition. In fact there is nothing like discipline in assemblies of men.

Having at length traversed the mountains in which they expected to be attacked, without meeting an enemy, they passed four cities on the sea-coast, Barut,[5] Sarepta, com-

[1] Botrys, now Batroun.
[2] Byblos, now Gebaïl.
[3] The Lycus, the Turkish name of which is Nahr-el-Kelb.
[4] Thursday, May 19.
[5] Berith, now Beyrout.

monly called Sagitta,[1] Tyre, which is also called Sor, and Acharon called Acre,[2] and afterwards a fortified place called Caiphas.[3] From thence they advanced towards Cæsarea,[4] to find quarters, and rested there on Whitsunday the fourth of the ides of June.[5] Afterwards they marched to Diospolis, called also Ramatha, Arimathea, and Ramula,[6] where they halted, in consequence of their fatigue; and the inhabitants, terrified by the approach of the pilgrims, deserted the town. The church formerly boasted a bishop in that place, but now the see was widowed and sunk in distress, since it was ingloriously subjected to the yoke of the Saracens. The Christians re-established a bishop in the city, and gave him the tenth of their substance that he might live by their offerings, and restore the long desolate church. It was there that the illustrious champion St. George had nobly contended for the faith, and gloriously ended his course by martyrdom. A church dedicated to his honour stands in a little suburb, where the precious remains of the confessor rest. The Christians wished to have this saint always their patron and companion, whom they had seen acting as their leader and guide in the battle of Antioch, and their mighty protector against the infidel nation. They therefore greatly honoured his church, and appointed a bishop at Ramula, as we have already related.

Inspired with religious ardour, the pilgrims set forward at day-break, and, on the signal being given, hastened onward on the road to Jerusalem, and accomplished on the

[1] Our author confounds Sarepta (now Sarphen) with Sidon (now Seide) which the crusaders actually passed. Concerning the venomous serpents they encountered in the neighbourhood of this city, and the singular remedy suggested to them by the inhabitants of the country, see Albert d'Aix, b. v. p. 40.

[2] St. John d'Acre.

[3] The ancient Caïpha stood at the extremity of a promontory to the S.W. of a little town which they call Caïpha-la-Neuve.

[4] Cæsarea of Palestine.

[5] Instead of the fourth of the ides, it should be of the calends, of June (May 29).

[6] Our author confounds Lydda, the ancient Diospolis, celebrated for the martyrdom of St. George, with Ramla. The crusaders took both these cities successively. It was in the first they established a bishop. He was a Norman, named Robert, a native of the diocese of Rouen.

same day[1] their long-cherished desire of reaching the holy city; for Jerusalem is distant twenty-four miles from Ramula. When they arrived at a spot from whence the towers of Jerusalem could be seen, the pilgrims stopped and, weeping with excessive joy, worshipped God, falling on their knees and kissing the holy ground. All proceeded with bare feet, except those who were compelled by necessary precaution to be armed against the enemy. So they went forward bathed in tears, and those who had come to pray, having first to fight, carried arms instead of scrips.

CH. XV. *The siege of Jerusalem—Stations of the chief crusaders—Several assaults—The place taken by storm—Sack of the city and massacre of the inhabitants—Devotion of the pilgrims at the holy sepulchre.*

ON the eighth of the ides [6th] of June,[2] the Christians invested Jerusalem, not as stepsons approaching a mother-in-law, but as children embracing their parent; for her friends and sons surrounded her to fetter the brood of aliens and bastards, not to deprive her of freedom, but to set her free. Robert, duke of Normandy, laid siege to Jerusalem on the north side near the church of St. Stephen the protomartyr, where, stoned by the Jews, he slept in the Lord. Near the Normans, the count of Flanders pitched his tents. Duke Godfrey and Tancred besieged the city on the west[3] Count Raymond sat down on the south side[4] on Mount Sion,

[1] This is a mistake. The crusaders passed the night between the 5th and 6th of June at the village of Anathot, which William of Tyre incorrectly calls Emmaüs, where they witnessed an eclipse of the moon. This place is now called St. Jeremy. In the course of the day following, they arrived under the walls of Jerusalem.

[2] On Monday the 6th of June; but it is probable that the city was not invested till the following day, Tuesday, according to the account of William of Tyre. Peter Tudebode, does not make them arrive till that day.

[3] Godfrey encamped at first, with the two Roberts, on the terrace facing the north of the ramparts. They were stationed before the gate now called the gate of Damascus, and the little gate of Herod, now walled up. It was not till afterwards that Godfrey shifted his quarters to the east angle of the walls, near the gate of St. Stephen. Tancred occupied the north-west quarter, quite alone, having pitched his camp against a tower, now ruined, which took his name.

[4] Raymond established himself first on the west, on the hills of St. George, over against the western gate and the tower of David, from which

round the church of St. Mary, mother of God, where the Lord Jesus supped with his disciples. Jerusalem therefore was beset and surrounded by her sons, while within she was profaned by a bastard population.

Then Hugh Bunel, son of Robert d'Igé,[1] presented himself to the duke of Normandy in a suit of excellent armour, offering to serve him faithfully as his natural lord, and being received with favour did good service in the siege of Jerusalem both by his valour and advice. He had long before assassinated in Normandy the Countess Mabel[2] who had forcibly deprived him of his father's inheritance, and in consequence of this flagitious deed had fled to Apulia, with his brothers Ralph, Richard, and Goislin, and he then went to Sicily, and afterwards took refuge with the emperor Alexius. But he could nowhere rest long in safety, for William the Bastard, king of England, and all the family of the murdered countess sent emissaries to seek him in every part of the world, promising honours and rewards to any one who should despatch the fugitive assassin wherever he could be found. The brave Hugh, fearing the strong hands and long arms of the powerful king, left Christendom behind him, and fearing nothing so much as the whole race of the baptized, became an exile for a long course of time among the Mahometans, whose manners and language he adopted for twenty years.[3] Being now well received by the Duke of Normandy, he was a great assistance to his countrymen, being able to detect the skilful manœuvres and stratagems which they contrived against the faithful.

Cosan, also, a noble and powerful chief of Turkish lineage, freely came over to the Christians, and aided them in various

his position was separated by the valley of Rephaïm and a vast and deep fish pond; but he removed to the south, on that part of Mount Sion which is not enclosed within the walls. All that portion of the city which extends from the gate of the Maugrabins to the gate of St. Stephen was not invested.

[1] See vol. ii. p.194. The name of Bunel is still common in Normandy.

[2] If Philip of Montgomery, surnamed the Grammarian, had not died at the siege of Antioch, one of the first persons the assassin would have seen about the duke would have been the son of his victim.

[3] The murder having been committed in December, 1082, only sixteen years and a half had intervened in June 1099, during which Hugh d'Igé had led this proscribed life. But our author often uses round numbers, and is not exact in such computations. Besides years of exile might well be counted double.

ways in the capture of the city. He had become a true believer in Christ, and his heart was set on the regeneration of holy baptism. Cosan therefore used his utmost efforts to second those of his adopted friends and brothers in securing the dominion of Palestine and the capital of the kingdom of David.

On the third day of the siege certain Christian knights went forth from the camp, namely Raymond Pilet, Raymond de Turenne,[1] and some others, for the purpose of reconnoitring the country or obtaining plunder, and falling in with two hundred Arabs, attacked, defeated, and put them to flight. They slew a great many and took thirty horses. After this exploit, they returned in triumph to the camp.

On Monday[2] the crusaders made a vigorous assault on the city, and it was believed they would have taken it if they had been sufficiently supplied with scaling ladders. They made a breach in the outer wall, and raised one ladder against the inner one. The Christian knights mounted it by turns and fought with the Saracens on the battlements hand to hand with swords and lances. In these assaults many fell on both sides, but most on the side of the Gentiles. The trumpets sounding the recall, the Christians at length withdrew from the combat, and returned to their camps. Meanwhile, the provisions they brought with them began to fail, nor could bread be purchased for money, nor was any one able to succeed in foraging. The country round is entirely without water, and is moreover arid and rocky, affording no pasture for the subsistence of beasts of burden or other animals. It is also naked of trees and therefore produces but little fruit; bearing only the olive and the palm, with a few vines. The

[1] Raymond, viscount de Turenne. See before, p. 162.

[2] Monday, June 13th. All the cotemporary accounts concur in this date except the *Belli Sacri Historia*, which makes it Friday. Notwithstanding this mistake, the narrative will be found worthy of attention. The author, after having related, like all the others, that the only ladder they had was raised against the wall, adds that it was with the greatest difficulty Tancred was prevented from venturing to mount it. Raimbaud Creton took his place, and at the moment he got to the top and laid hold of the battlement to secure his footing, his hand was cut off. They were obliged to carry him back to the camp, and reserve the ladder for a more favourable opportunity. The posterity of this brave man still exists in the family of the counts of Creton-d'Estourmel, who have preserved for eight centuries a portion of the true cross, presented by Godfrey to their valiant ancestor.

river Jordan is at the distance, it is computed, of nearly thirty stadia from Jerusalem. Connected with it, are six lakes, but they lie far away. There are cisterns within the walls which supply the city. At the foot of Mount Sion is the fountain of Siloah, but its waters could only slake the thirst of a very small number. It was, however, in great request, and a small quantity of it was sold at a high rate. They led the horses six miles to water, at considerable risk.

Meanwhile, news arrived in the camp that merchant ships belonging to Christians had arrived at Japhi, which I think was anciently called Joppa.[1] This intelligence spread great joy throughout the army, and the chiefs took counsel for providing for the safety of those who went to and fro between the camp and the ships for the transport of necessaries. Joppa is about eight miles distant from Ramula; and the people of Ascalon, and the wandering tribes of natives in the mountains or in the fastnesses of the steep defiles, sometimes sallied forth and massacred parties of travellers. Their movements, or rumours of them, harassed the convoys despatched by the merchants. To put an end to this, Raymond Pilet, Achard de Montmel,[2] and William de Sabran,[3] with one hundred men-at-arms of the division of the Count of Tholouse, sallied forth at the dawn of day, and, followed by a body of foot soldiers, began their march towards the sea-coast. They were proceeding to the port, trusting in their own valour, when their force became separated into two bodies, whether purposely or from mistaking the road, we cannot say. However, thirty of the horsemen who took a different direction from the rest fell in with a hundred Arabs, Turks, and Saracens, belonging to the emir's army, and boldly charging them closed with them and engaged in battle.

[1] Now Jaffa.

[2] Montmel in the Herault.

[3] William de Sabran (Gard) was living in 1123. He was nephew of Emenon or Amaujeu de Sabran, the first person known of this family, whose signature to a document is found in 1029. The descendants of William assumed the title of constables by the grace of God of the counts of Tholouse. He is thought to be the person who, at the siege of Antioch, surprised the wife and family of Bagui-Syan in bed, and got from them 3000 bezants of gold. The historians say it was a person of the name of William, one of the followers of the count of Tholouse.

Peter Tudebode adds to these names that of William Carpinel.

The enemy gave them a warm reception, and trusting in their superior numbers surrounded the small band of Christians. Such is the mode of fighting among the Saracens. They had already succeeded in this, and were talking confidently of the slaughter they looked forward to, when a messenger despatched to Raymond Pilet shouted aloud, as he called to him: "Fly with the utmost speed to the succour of your comrades, for without your aid they will all be cut off. They are surrounded by the enemy, but as yet they are doing their best to defend themselves."

On hearing this, they gave their horses the reins, and spurring onward flew quicker than thought to the spot. Each knight clasping his shield to his breast levelled his spear at a horseman in the enemy's ranks, and each brought his foe to the earth. Appearing thus unexpectedly on the scene, they turned the scale, and drawing their swords, by God's help, changed the fortune of the day. The Pagans tried to rally their forces, and forming them into two troops, prolong the conflict, but were not able. For the Franks charged them again with such impetuosity, that they released their comrades who were beset, and who lost only Achard, a brave knight and some foot soldiers. Having pursued the flying Turks four miles, cutting down many of the fugitives, they saved one hundred and three horses, and took one man alive, who was compelled to give a particular account of all that was planned against the Christians.

Meanwhile, the Christians employed in the siege were suffering the torments of constant thirst. The Pagans lay in ambush for the people who had to drive the horses six miles to water, and occasioned them great losses in the narrow defiles. Cedron and the other torrents were dried up by the excessive drought. Even barley-bread was dear in the camp. The natives, concealing themselves in dens and caverns, interrupted all convoys of provisions.

The chiefs of the army assembled in council to consider what was to be done in the midst of these calamities. They said: "We are in difficulties on all sides; bread is wanting; the water has failed. We ourselves are, in fact, closely blockaded, while we fancy we are besieging this city. We can hardly venture outside our camp, and when we do, return empty. Our long delays have produced the scarcity, and,

unless we find a remedy, matters will become worse. This place can never be taken by the mere strength of our hands and arms without the aid of engines of war. We have to contend against walls, and bulwarks, and towers; we are opposed by a numerous garrison who make an obstinate defence. What, then, is your opinion? Let us undertake something which will relieve ourselves and distress the besieged. We want timber to construct machines for assaulting the walls and towers of the place. As the country is not woody, let us take the rafters of the houses and beams from the churches, and shape them to our purpose, so that we may attack the city in the most determined manner; otherwise, we waste our time to no purpose."

At length the faithful champions of the cross discovered some timber at a great distance from the camp,[1] to which they transported it with vast labour. Carpenters were assembled from the whole army, some of whom hewed the rough surface of the trees, others squared it and bored it, while the rest fitted the beams and planks together. Duke Godfrey built one machine at his own expense; the count of Tholouse caused another to be constructed at his proper cost. On the other hand, the Saracens used every effort to strengthen the fortifications, raising the towers higher by working in the night, and devoting themselves without respite to increase the defences.

One Saturday[2] Duke Godfrey's machine was transported in the dead of the night to the foot of the walls, and erected before sunrise, three days being employed in unremitting exertions to fit the parts together and prepare it for use. The count of Tholouse caused his machine, which might be called a castle of wood, to be placed near the wall on the south of the place, but a deep hollow prevented its being joined to the wall. Such machines cannot be guided on declivities nor carried up steep places, and can only be

[1] According to M. Michaud, this timber was procured from the forest districts of Samaria and Gabaon. Gaston, viscount of Bearn, who was very skilful in constructing engines of war had the superintendence of the works The duke of Normandy was one of the chiefs employed to escort the convoy. See in the *Belli Sacri Historia* and the *Gesta Tancredi*, the very unpoetical circumstances which occasioned Tancred to discover beams already prepared for building the machines.

[2] Saturday, the 9th of July.

transported on level ground. Proclamation was therefore made through the camp, that whoever should cast three stones into the hole should for so doing receive a penny. In consequence all the people who were weary of delay lent a hand willingly to the proposed work.

The bishops and priests addressed the multitude in moving discourses, pointing with their fingers, while they spoke of the death of Christ, to the very spot on which he suffered; and while describing with holy eloquence the heavenly Jerusalem, taking for its type the terrestrial one before which they were assembled. In consequence, all the laity flew to arms, and made a general attack on the city during Wednesday and Thursday, which was continued by night as well as by day. Again, having been prepared by fasting and supplications, tears and alms, and strengthened by the communion of the consecrated host, they renewed their attack at the first dawn of the morning of Friday, the ides [15th] July,[1] but without success; for the besieged to whom the defence of the walls and towers was committed mutually co-operated in hurling fire and stones on the assailants. The count of Tholouse, having filled up the hollow, which took three days and nights to accomplish, brought his wooden tower up to the wall, and then permitted his troops to rest till Monday on account of the great toil they had undergone for a whole week.

After the fatigues of the morning the Franks, by their commander's order, withdrew awhile from the assault, and the Pagans from the defence. The emir, Guinimond,[2] and his nephew Frigolind, the Persian, held the tower of David, and had assembled there the magistrates and principal persons of the city for a conference. Meanwhile the women of the place collected on the terraced roofs of the houses, as is the custom in Palestine, and sang by turns, answering one another with shrill voices, a song to the following effect:—

"Praise be to Mahomet our god![3] sound the glad tim-

[1] There had been an assault the evening before, which failed.

[2] Iftikar-Eddaulé, the glory of the empire, the caliph's lieutenant in Egypt, to whose dominion Jerusalem had been subjected towards the close of the preceding year, by the exertions of the vizier Afdhal; our author is, therefore, wrong in representing the city as still belonging to the Turks at the time of the siege.

[3] The shrill chant which Ordericus puts into the mouth of the women of

brels and offer him victims, that our terrible enemies may be overcome and perish.

"See how they swell and strut with barbaric pride, attacking without mercy the nations of the east, and eagerly pillaging the rich produce of our land.

"The strangers are driven by want from their barren country to our fruitful soil, where they plunder fertile provinces. They curse our people, and regard them as wild beasts.

"Washed by baptism, they worship a crucified God, treating our rites, our worship and divinities, with contempt; but vengeance and destruction speedily await them.

"Valiant Turks, repel by your courage the assaults of the Franks! Be mindful of the glorious deeds of your forefathers! This very day, your enemies will either flee or perish."

While the Turkish women raised their voices in such songs as these from the flat roofs of their houses, the Christians listened in astonishment, inquiring curiously from their interpreters what these sounds meant. Then Conon, a German count, a brave knight and wise counsellor, who had married the sister of Duke Godfrey, said: "Do you hear, my lord duke, what these women say? Do you understand what they mean? When the men faint with toil and apprehension, the women rouse themselves and heap reproaches on our heads, to the shame and discredit of their warriors, daring to terrify and mock us by their empty cries; but they will suffer for it; let us be roused to manly, nay, to heavenly resolution. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered on the sixth day of the week, let us fly to arms, and making a signal assault on the city, go this very day to the sepulchre of our Lord.

Accordingly, at the third hour, being the time at which the Jews condemned the Lord in Pilate's presence, the Christians, in memory of his passion, took fresh courage, and inspired with new daring commenced the assault, as if they had suffered nothing before. Duke Godfrey and his

Jerusalem gathered on the flat roofs of their houses, would have considerable dramatic effect, were it not disfigured by entire ignorance of the fundamental doctrines and the rites of Mahometanism.

brother Eustace fought bravely at the head of the troops, and the rest followed their lead. Then Letold and Rambold Croton,[1] two brave soldiers, mounted the walls, and, uttering loud cries, continued to struggle without giving way. They were followed by several others, and those who had hitherto defended the fortifications fled on all sides, and no longer thought of the defence of the city. Crowds of Christians then rushed in, and, pursuing the fugitives, gave no quarter.[2]

The Armenian, Greek, and Syrian inhabitants of Jerusalem, who had been under the Turkish yoke, and had, under great difficulties, maintained Christian worship to the

[1] Historians do not agree in the name nor even the country of the crusaders who were the first to escalade the walls of Jerusalem. Several of them endeavour to claim the distinction for their countrymen, or at least a share of it. According to the chronicle of St. Brienne, the first was a Breton followed by two Normans. Ralph de Caen gives the honour to a Norman lord, Bernard de St. Valleri, a kinsman of Duke Robert, who has been twice mentioned in the course of the narrative.

It appears, however, plain that the first who actually gained the summit of the walls of the holy city were two brothers, natives of Tournay, and belonging to Godfrey's division of the army. One was called *Letalde, Letold*, or *Ludolfe*, and the other *Engelbert*. As for Rambold Creton, we have already seen that his escalade took place on the assault of the 13th of June. The claims of Bernard de St. Valleri to the honours of the 15th of July appear better founded.

The author of the *Belli Sancti Historia*, who was an eye-witness and quite disinterested in the question of national vanity, tells us what really passed. A piece of timber having been let down from the wooden tower to the wall, so as to establish a connection between them, Bernard de St. Valleri immediately began to make his way to the battlements, astride on this beam, but while he was accomplishing this perilous and difficult exploit, the two Belgians ran to the scaling-ladders, mounted them with great rapidity, and were the first to leap from the wall into the interior of the place. The Norman was, therefore the third who reached the summit, and, perhaps annoyed at having been thus distanced, penetrated into the city, with those who followed him, by another street. There he signalized himself as the author tells us, by a sword-cut, worthy to be compared with those of Godfrey and Robert of Normandy under the walls of Antioch, already mentioned.

[2] Ordericus has not told us by what quarter the main body of the crusaders penetrated into the Holy City. According to the author of the *Belli Sacri Historia*, it was by the gate of the valley of Jehosaphat, after having unhung the wicket. This eye-witness paints with fearful vividness the multitude rushing in to pillage the place, while the knights were engaged in massacring all the inhabitants they met, without distinction of age or sex, and the chiefs were encouraging and directing this horrible butchery.

best of their power, as soon as they saw the crusaders storming the city, fled in a body to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and began devoutly chanting the *Kyrie eleison*, and other prayers suited to the exigency of the occasion, while they waited the issue of events. Meanwhile Tancred and his followers, having lost their way, by God's providence lighted on the church, and discovering by their prayers and religious ceremonies that the people were worshippers of Christ, he said to his followers: "These men are Christians, none of you presume to do them any injury: we are not come here to afflict the worshippers of Christ, but to deliver them from their cruel persecutors. They are our brothers and friends, whose worth has been proved by severe trials, like gold in the furnace." Then the illustrious champion left there Bigod d'Igé, the commander of his troops, with two hundred soldiers to guard the church, and prevent the pagans from again taking possession of it. Tancred himself, with the rest of his followers, marched to the assault of other parts of the fortifications, and to assist their comrades who were scouring the city and putting the Saracens[1] to the sword. Meanwhile the Christian natives, who remained with Bigod d'Igé in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, had private conferences with him, and

[1] *Allophilos.* Our author has employed this word before to designate the Mahomedan conquerors of the Holy Land. A capital letter is used for the initial both in the text of Duchesne, and of the Historical Society of France, seeming to indicate that the word represents a nation, tribe, or sect, and it has been suggested that it may be translated worshippers (or more closely) votaries of Allah. But the text of Duchesne, though in general less correct than that of the recent French edition, which follows the MS. of St. Evroult,) spells it Allophylos, and it seems most probable that Ordericus used the word in the sense of ἀλλόφυλος (ἄλλος and φυλή) *of another race, not a Jew*, in which sense it is employed in Acts x. 28. In the Septuagint the word is used in Isa. lxi. 5, and ib. 6, for "the stranger," and "sons of the stranger." See also 2 Maccab. x. 2, 5, and Joseph. Antiq. i. 21, and iv. 8; Diod. Sic. i. 35; Thucyd. i. 102. Allophyli is frequently employed by Sulpitius Severus (A.D. 427) to designate the Philistines or Syrians: "Israelitæ subjecti Allophylis," "Uxorem habuit ex Allophylis;" and several other passages. As the word was thus used, before the time of Mahomet, to represent the inhabitants of the very district of which Ordericus speaks, Duchesne's reading of Allophyli, not Allophili, is probably correct, but without the initial capital. The other version, notwithstanding the turn this gives it, besides the sound, would make the word a strange compound.

desiring to secure his protection, conducted him and his companions, with great courtesy, to the holy places, namely, the sepulchre of the Lord, and other sacred objects, showing them some things which they and their predecessors had long hidden in concealed recesses, for fear of the pagans. Amongst other holy relics, Bigod d'Igé there found, in a marble urn, deposited in a place hollowed under the altar, a little packet of the hair of St. Mary, mother of God, which he afterwards carried with him to France, and reverently distributed among the sanctuaries of the cathedrals and abbey-churches. For the mother, always a virgin, being in the deepest distress during the passion of Christ, her son and Lord, according to the custom of the nation and of those times, rent her clothes and tore her hair, and devoutly uttered lamentable cries for the death of her illustrious friend. The devout women of the neighbourhood who were present, and had long attached themselves to the service of the divine Master, affectionately supported the weeping mother of the King of heaven, and lavished upon her all the endearing attentions which her circumstances required. They then piously gathered up and carefully preserved the hair which had been plucked, and John the Divine,[1] and other followers of Christ, afterwards deposited it in a place of security, foreseeing how many would profit by it. I have inserted this account in my work, because the before-named Bigod d'Igé gave two of these sacred hairs to a monk of Chartres, who was his cousin, which he transfecred to the church of Maule, where many sick persons were healed by their virtue.

The emir, who commanded the tower of David, with the chief persons of the city, and many others assembled there, presented themselves in the greatest terror to Count Raymond, and opened the gate to him without delay.[2] The

[1] On this title given to St. John, see vol. i., p. 238. In the printed text of Duchesne, the name of this apostle is always spelt *Joannes*, but the MS. of St. Evroult, and usage of the times rendered it *Johannes*.

[2] This small number of Mussulmans were the only persons who escaped the carnage, thanks to the vigilant protection of the count of Tholouse, who was much reproached for this act of humanity. Tancred was less fortunate, as we shall find, in his endeavour to save those who took refuge in the mosque built on the site of Solomon's Temple. The brave knight had, according to the report of his panegyrist, Ralph de Caen, to submit to

entrance at this gate was only to be obtained before for money, it being here that the pilgrims paid the tax for admission into the city, and without it they were mercilessly driven from the gate.

The dispersed citizens again collected, and made a stand in the temple of Solomon, where they resisted stoutly the attacks of the Christians, but being at last driven to despair, they laid down their arms and submitted to their fate. No one knows the number of the slain, but the floor of the temple was knee-deep in blood, and great heaps of corpses were piled up in all quarters of the city, as the victors spared neither age, sex, rank, nor condition of any kind. They exercised this bitter vengeance upon the heathen and thus massacred them, because they had profaned the temple of the Lord and the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and had used the temple of Solomon and the other churches for their own accursed rites, and foully polluted them. Some had taken refuge on the roof of Solomon's temple and begged that Tancred's standard might be planted there, so that under its protection they might hope for a better fortune. But it profited them little or nothing, for not even these were spared by the Christians, except that they suffered some few to live that they might employ them in burying the dead; but these were afterwards butchered or sold as slaves. Tancred was much grieved at this, but he did not quarrel with his companions about it.[1] As for the count of Tholouse, he conveyed in safety to Ascalon the emir who had surrendered to him, and given up the tower of David with the rest of his party; for he had made them a promise to that effect, and he kept his engagement. The victors did not pillage and set on fire this city like other places taken by storm, but finding the houses well supplied with all conveniences, they reserved them for their own use, and many liberally shared with the poor the stores they found. Each one quietly appropriated the first house he came to,

another humiliation in having to refund 700 marks of silver, to compensate for the rapacity with which he had pillaged this mosque.

[1] If we may believe Peter Tudebode, the affair was far less honourable to Tancred's character, and he himself caused it to be proclaimed by the public crier, on Saturday morning, that whoever wanted to kill Mussulmans had nothing else to do but to go to the mosque of Solomon's Temple.

whether it was large or small, deserted by the Pagans, and taking free possession of it with all the wealth it contained, preserves it as his heritage to the present day.

The crusaders, having thus at length secured their triumph, hastened in crowds to cover with kisses the tomb of their blessed Saviour, having first cleansed their hands from the stain of blood; and many of them approaching it with bare feet and tears of joy, offered their thanksgivings and sacrifices of peace. The faithful indulged in transports of joy, now that they had gained the object of their long cherished hopes, which they had sought through so many toils and dangers. They now witnessed with delight the end of their labours, and being secure for the present formed exalted conceptions of their future recompense. However their immediate attention was called to the necessity of clearing the city of the bodies of the slain, for the spectacle was horrid and the stench insupportable. The corpses were therefore piled in heaps by the captive Gentiles and the poorer pilgrims who were paid for the service, and being burnt, the city was thus freed from impurities.

CH. XVI. *Godfrey of Bouillon elected king of Jerusalem—A bishop appointed—The Mussulmans collect an army and threaten the city—The crusaders march out to attack them.*

THE faithful soldiers of Christ settled themselves securely in the city of Jerusalem, rendering due thanks to God by whose free goodness they had triumphed over the heathen. They restored the churches to their former honours, and fitted them all for the work of prayer. A feast was instituted on Friday the 10th of July, to commemorate the taking of the city. They also held a council for the appointment of a king, and on the eighth day[1] after the conquest of Jerusalem, elected Duke Godfrey. He was of royal blood, and his ancestors were distinguished for their Christian profession. Eustace, count of Boulogne, who was with William at the battle of Senlac in England, married Ita, daughter of Godfrey, duke of Lorraine, by whom he had Baldwin, Godfrey, and Eustace, who were by God's grace

[1] According to some historians the election of Godfrey took place on the tenth day, Sunday the 24th of July.

much advanced in the world in wealth, and power, and were especially proved, strengthened, and elevated in the expedition to Jerusalem. Godfrey, being the eldest, was raised to the throne of King David, because he had triumphed in the war conducted with great ability after the French manner, being both in heart and arm a most valiant warrior, as well as generous and mild, and distinguished for his clemency.

At the same time Arnulf de Zocris,[1] a very learned man, was elected to fill the functions of bishop. Meanwhile, Tancred and Count Eustace, with their vassals and retainers, marched to Neapolis[2] on the invitation of the inhabitants, who gave up the place to them and made a treaty of peace. They remained there some days, enjoying their repose, until the king of Jerusalem sent messengers to them with great

[1] It is singular that our author has told us so little of this remarkable person. His name was not *Arnuljus de Zocris*, but *Arnulfus de Rohes, Castello Flandriæ*, probably Rocuix, near Valenciennes. All the historians agree as to his learning and ability. He made his profession at Caen with great credit, Ralph de Caen, who was one of his scholars, speaks of him with veneration and enthusiasm. The princess Cecilia, who was then a nun, and afterwards abbess, of the monastery of the Holy Trinity at Caen, recommended him as chaplain to her brother, when he embarked on his pilgrimage for the Holy Land. It appears, even, that Duke Robert had engaged to take the first favourable opportunity of making him a bishop. Odo, bishop of Bayeux, on his death at Palermo, left him the greatest part of his splendid effects. If Ralph de Caen is to be believed, Bishop Adhemar also bequeathed to him his authority, so as to justify the singular title of vice-bishop which the historian gives him from the time of the death of the bishop of Puy.

But as Arnulf had been the principal opponent of the authenticity of the holy spear at Antioch, most of the historians of the crusades, and especially the fellow countrymen of Peter Barthelemi, have not spared him. They affirm that he was the natural son of a priest, and ought in that quality to have been attached as a serf to the service of the church to which his birth had occasioned scandal; that he was not even a sub-deacon, and that his irregularities during the crusade had made him the subject of the taunts and songs of the people. It is however difficult to believe that a prince, even so little scrupulous as the duke of Normandy, would have received as chaplain from his pious sister a man who was not even qualified by one of the lowest degrees of holy orders. However this may be, Arnulf, elected patriarch on St. Peter's day (August 1), was deposed before the end of the year, which seems a strong confirmation of the charges made against him. His predecessor Symon II. died in the island of Cyprus during the siege of Jerusalem by the crusaders.

[2] Naplouse.

haste, saying: "We have heard for certain that the emir of Babylon[1] is at Ascalon, and making great preparations for hostilities against us. Hasten therefore your return, that we may encounter him boldly before he shuts us up in the city. When once blockaded, both ingress and egress will be difficult; let us meet him therefore on a fair field, and by God's help our success will be proportionably easy and triumphant. We are more active in our movements and the use of arms than the Turks, and we should wish to meet them while they think they have nothing to apprehend." On hearing this, Tancred and Eustace marched to Ramula on the sea coast, and finding a number of Arabs, the advanced guard of the emir's army, they attacked with spirit and speedily dispersed them. Putting some to the sword, they spared others to obtain from them exact accounts of the emir and his army. They therefore learnt all particulars as to who they were, their numbers, what were their intentions, and in what quarter they would make an attack.

Tancred sent to the king the account he had carefully gathered from the reports of the prisoners. "Know for certain," he said, "that they are really preparing for war against us at Ascalon, and that nearly all the world is assembling and conspiring against us, thinking to defeat and crush us. Collecting then your whole forces, come and let us lay hold of this synagogue of Satan. For, as you say, if we attack them fearlessly and unawares, we shall easily overcome them by God's help, as they are encumbered with arms and baggage, and are bringing with them engines of war to assault the city." In consequence, the king caused his heralds to proclaim that all should prepare themselves for battle, and march immediately under the royal standard. The king therefore, with the patriarchs before-named, the count of Flanders and the bishop of Martorano,[2] marched out of Jerusalem on the third day.[3] The count of St.

[1] The vizir Afdhal, who had reduced Jerusalem under his master's dominion some months before, as lately remarked.

[2] Arnulf, bishop of Martorano, a suffragan of Cosenza, in the Hither Calabria. Ralph de Caen does not give us a high notion of the ability of this prelate.

[3] Tuesday the 9th of August.

Giles and the Normans delayed their departure until they heard more particulars respecting the march of the emir.[1] When the king had observed the enemy's preparations, he sent the bishop of Martorano to Jerusalem to inform the princes of the state of affairs; and after conferring with the counts of Tholouse and Normandy, he was hastening to carry back their message to the king and the patriarch, when he fell into the hands of the Pagans, and whether he was slain or carried away captive it is not known, but he was never seen afterwards.[2]

The counts of Tholouse and Normandy began their march for the scene of war with large bodies of troops, leaving Jerusalem on the fourth day of the week.[3] The clergy offered ceaseless prayers and masses. Peter the hermit and a small number of unarmed people who remained behind, together with the defenceless women, made processions from church to church, and spent their time in prayers and alms, imploring God in his mercy to be propitious to his people, and signally overthrow the enemy with his mighty arm. The chiefs with their respective followers were now assembled on the banks of the river which runs near Ascalon. They found large herds of cattle feeding there of which they secured a great number. The Franks were pursued by three hundred Arabs, but they turned upon them and drove them to the camp with the loss of two prisoners. After this excursion the Christians retired to their camp, where they rested during the night, or rather almost all were occupied in keeping watch and saying their prayers. Late in the evening, an order was issued by the patriarch forbidding any pillage by the troops until the battle which was to be fought on the morrow should be ended.

[1] It was not so much their uncertainty respecting the march of the emir which detained the count of Tholouse and the duke of Normandy at Jerusalem to the last moment, as their indifference for Godfrey's interest, which alone they affected to consider as involved in this contest. His elevation to a throne, however unstable and far from splendid, immediately occasioned much jealousy among his companions in arms.

[2] This prelate's being carried off by the Mussulmans was generally considered a punishment from heaven for the part he had taken in the election of the bishop of Jerusalem, his namesake.

[3] On Wednesday, August 10.

CH. XVII. *The battle of Ascalon—Victory of the crusaders over the vastly superior forces of the infidels—Dispute between the king of Jerusalem and Godfrey count of Tholouse about the possession of the town.*

AT sun-rise on the day before the ides [the 12th] of August,[1] the holy army of Christ took up its position in a level and pleasant valley near the sea, being formed into six divisions. Of these the king, the counts of Normandy, Tholouse and Flanders, with Gaston, Eustace, and Tancred, each put himself at the head of his own knights and cavalry, and gave precise orders to his bowmen and foot soldiers. They were detached in advance with instructions when they should shout their war-cries and make attacks, when they should stand firm, when they should press vigorously the close ranks of the enemy; and constantly to watch the advance of their standards in the rear, fearing nothing, and never recoiling although severely handled by their adversaries. All this indeed the Christian soldiers had learnt in many well-fought fields.

On the other side, the Gentiles drew out their troops innumerable as the stars, ranging their countless legions in squadrons from flank to flank of the Christian army. The Ethiopians were placed in the van, with orders not to move. They had one knee planted on the ground, and covering the upper part of their bodies with their shields were armed with arrows and swords. They were forbidden to make the least move in retreat, or to advance more than a single pace from the ground they occupied. These trained bands held their position, according to their orders. To provide against the excessive thirst to which they were exposed by the heat, the clouds of dust, and the fatigue and length of the battle, they had gourds full of water suspended from their necks that they might be able to hold their ground, or pursue the fugitives without respite. As to their flying themselves, such a thing was never thought of; animated as they were by their

[1] Friday, August 12, instead of which read Sunday, August 14. Our author having spoken of only six divisions of the army, names seven commanders. It would appear that the fifth corps was placed under the orders of Eustace, count of Boulogne, and the sixth under those of Tancred and Gaston jointly, as was the case at the battle of Antioch.

vast numbers, by the fierce courage of barbarous nations, and by the order of their commander [1] who had declared that fugitives should lose their heads.

Both armies being thus drawn up in battle array and arived on the field, the Christians halted for a short time, and raising their eyes upwards knelt on the ground and prayed devoutly; for they looked for help from heaven, from whence they had often been sensible of receiving it in their necessities. After offering a short prayer, and reverently making the sign of the blessed cross on their foreheads, they mounted their horses in great confidence, and, in the name of the Lord Jesus, undauntedly charged the enemy; for the Gentiles had now halted, and waited the attack in an immovable attitude. The count of Tholouse rode at the head of his cavalry on the right wing of the army towards the sea. The king's division hastened forward on the left. The duke of Normandy, the count of Flanders, with Tancred and others, were posted in the centre; but there were ten Mahometans in the ranks for one of our people. At the beginning of the battle, Robert duke of Normandy, perceiving at a distance the emir's standard, which exhibited an apple of gold on the point of a spear, the staff shining with silver plates, by which the duke learnt the emir's station in the line, he singled him out in the midst of the squadrons, and rushing furiously at him gave him a mortal wound.[2] This greatly checked the enemy's daring. The count of Flanders now charged them, and the fearless Tancred dashed into the middle of their camp. The pagan cavalry presently turned round and fled. The Ethiopians were struck with panic but did not move. The king however, and some of the

[1] The vizir Afdhal.

[2] This is a correct account with the exception of the word *mortal*. "The standard," observes M. Prevost, "like that of Richard-Cœur-de-Lion in the subsequent crusade, might be a long staff fixed in a car moving on four wheels, and surmounted by a flag, or other ensign, which placed in the centre of the army served for a rallying point." We have had, however, several instances of the banners or pennons of the knights being borne in the hand, which we think was also the more usual custom with respect to the standards of the commanders, and was probably the case with the vizir's at the battle of Ascalon, as we find it was so portable as to have been afterwards placed as a trophy in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, if not in that of the Holy Trinity at Caen.

Franks, wheeled towards them and halting a moment cut them down as corn is reaped in harvest, severing their heads from their bodies with strokes of their swords. The field flowed with blood and was covered with the corpses of the pagans. The Christians pursued the fugitives, who, terrified by the Divine influence, had no opportunity of rallying. Their sight was so dimmed that, as it was afterwards related by some who escaped, although their eyes were open, they could scarcely see the Christians, and were wholly incapable of resisting them. Even numbers were unable to make a stand against a few, but tried every means of getting out of their way. Our victorious troops punished the Pagans without exception, sparing no one. It was a fatal day to them, for they found no means of escaping; for trees, rocks, and the deepest recesses of caves gave them up to the swords of the conquerors.

Count Raymond, whose position lay towards the coast, slew immense numbers, and pursued them vigorously towards the city which stood at a short distance. They fell on the way by fatigue, or were cut down with mortal wounds, or threw themselves into the sea, and thus rushed from one kind of death to another. The emir's fleet covered the sea waiting the issue of the battle. Seeing that a different fortune from what they expected awaited their friends, the Pagans embarked in their ships, and setting sail steered for their own country. It is reported that the emir, half fainting, groaned aloud, and thus vented his grief: "Creator of all things! how is this? How is it that so terrible a fate has fallen to our lot? Alas! what unutterable disgrace, what endless shame has involved our race? A nation of mendicants, a nation small in number, has prevailed against us. How is this? I assembled and led here two hundred thousand cavalry, and infantry without number, enough, I thought, to conquer the world. Now, to speak the truth, they have been shamefully defeated by less than a thousand cavalry, and thirty thousand infantry. Either their God is omnipotent, and fights on their side, or ours is incensed with us, and chastises and punishes us in the fierceness of his wrath. However this may be, one thing is certain; I will never again take arms against the Christians, but will return to my own country where my disgrace will only end with my life." These words

were mingled with sighs and groans from the depth of his heart.

The inhabitants of Ascalon, perceiving the fugitive Saracens making for the town, and entering it in crowds, while Count Raymond with his provincials was pursuing and cutting them down without respite, shut their gates to exclude both their enemies and their allies. For they feared that their invincible foes would enter the town along with their friends, and massacring the citizens completely subjugate it. Nevertheless, the undaunted Count of Tholouse halted his troops under the walls, and butchered such of the Saracens as lingered about their asylum, like a flock of sheep. The inhabitants therefore, seeing from their battlements the determined spirit of the Christians, and apprehensive that the indiscriminate slaughter they now witnessed or had heard of as the lot of their neighbours, might overtake themselves, begged the count to send them his ensign, and promised faithfully to surrender the place to him. They were more disposed to this because the count was the the nearest of the chiefs, and the danger from him was most threatening, and also because he had saved the emir Guinimund and the rest who had trusted to his word. The count sent his standard to the citizens who asked for it, and having dispersed and slain all the enemy who were under the walls, joined his comrades who were resting after the carnage, and having assembled them together, thus addressed them: "Thanks be to God, the victory is on our side, and the citizens of Ascalon are almost reduced to open their gates to us. They have already received my standard, and if you grant permission will willingly accept me for their master, and obey my commands, for the sake of saving themselves." The king replied: "Far be it from me to yield the dominion of this place to any one: I will compel it to surrender and submit to my authority. Ascalon is very near Jerusalem, and it is expedient that both should be under the rule of the same prince." Robert of Normandy and the count of Flanders, and the other chiefs remonstrated with the king, saying: "We all know well-enough that the count of St. Giles left his rich lands and well fortified towns for the service of God. During this holy enterprise, he has performed many brilliant achievements, and has excelled us all by the resolution he has shown

in great trials and sufferings. If therefore he is determined to persevere in the duties of the pilgrimage he has undertaken, and defend the holy city which he has shown so much zeal in recovering to the faith of God, you ought willingly to relinquish to him this place, which is not yet in your possession, and which he claims. When we are returned to our own states, you will doubtless have need enough of his counsels and active support. Ascalon will be a noble and useful fief of the crown of Jerusalem, and this great lord will pay you homage and perform military service for it."

The king refusing to follow the advice of the chiefs, the count departed in a rage, and sent word to the inhabitants of Ascalon to make an obstinate defence. The king wanted to besiege it, but all the chiefs abandoning him through fatigue and anger, he could do nothing by himself, and was compelled to draw off much chagrined, leaving the place uninjured. Neither Godfrey, nor the other kings who reigned after him during the course of forty years,[1] to their shame be it spoken, have ever been able to the present day to reduce this capital of the Philistines; on the contrary, it has been the cause of their losing more than a hundred thousand men, besides suffering other disasters. Such was the consequence of an insatiable ambition. If the king had possessed a true spirit of charity, and following the law of God, had loved his neighbour as himself, he might have obtained possession of the hostile city that very day, and thereby secured a free passage for the Christians even to Babylon. I acknowledge the great merits of King Godfrey, but in this, as St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "I praise him not."[2]

It is reported that the emir had in the battle two hundred thousand cavalry, and countless bodies of infantry, while the Christians had scarcely one thousand cavalry and thirty thousand infantry. After having, by God's help, defeated the enemy, they proceeded to plunder the tents of the Ishmaelites. They found there, to speak shortly,

[1] This calculation would seem to indicate, if it were not for the little confidence we can place in our author's round numbers, that the close of this ninth book was not written before the year 1139.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 22.

everything that can be imagined as valuable; silver and gold, corn, meal, and oil, innumerable herds of cattle, rich ornaments, piles of arms, and if it be possible things more precious. Having pillaged the camp of this booty, they returned to the holy city of Jerusalem, and offered thanksgivings to God in all the churches for their success.

Robert, duke of Normandy, bought the emir's standard, for twenty silver marks, from those who took it when he was wounded, and placed it in the church of the Holy Sepulchre in memory of this victory.[1] Some one else purchased the emir's sword for sixty bezants. All Christendom was filled with unspeakable joy on hearing the issue of the war.

Thus the crusaders delivered Jerusalem from the power of the impious Turks in the year of our Lord 1099, having often triumphed over them, under Christ their leader. The great battle of which we have last spoken was fought on the second of the ides [the 12th] of August, and in consequence thanksgivings were offered to God throughout the Christian world.

Ch. XVIII. *Some account of Baldric, archbishop of Dol, from whose account of the crusade the previous narrative is taken—Conclusion of the present book.*

Thus far I have followed the steps of the venerable Baldric,[2] in giving a true account of the noble army of Christ, which by God's help, fought the swarms of the Gentiles with such signal success in the countries of the East. In many places I have quoted the very words used by that writer, not daring to alter his language, as I did not think I could improve it. Some things I have curtailed, that I might not weary the reader with the length of my narrative, and others of which he was silent I have added for the benefit of posterity, from information I have carefully gathered from persons who

[1] If Wace may be trusted (t. ii. p. 392), this standard was deposited by Robert in the church of the Holy Trinity at Caen; but it is probable that with his usual want of precision he has confounded the standard of the battle of Ascalon, with some other ensign taken by the duke in a war which furnished so many spoils of this description as the first crusade did.

[2] See the note respecting Bishop Baldric at the beginning of the present book, p. 59.

shared the toils and perils of the expedition. I ought to respect and venerate the old prelate, with whom I had an intimate acquaintance. He was a citizen of Orleans, and had been a monk, and afterwards abbot of Bourgeuil, and was well imbued with learning, as well as much respected for his virtue and piety. His religion and wisdom were the means of his election to the diginity of archbishop of Dol.[1] But when a bishop he still observed the monastic discipline, and as often as he had opportunity resided among the monks. Having the rude Bretons for his flock, whose insubordination he could not bear, he frequently escaped from their lawless insolence, and took refuge in Normandy,[2] where the church of Dol had possessed domains on the river Risle[3] from the time of St. Samson, who lived in the reign of Childebert, king of the Franks, which it still enjoyed in undisturbed tranquillity. There, not only by his writings, but by his discourses, he invited his hearers to the service of God, and paid visits to the abbeys of Fécamp, Fontenelles, Jumièges, and other monasteries in that neighbourhood, comforting the monks in the fear of the Lord, by his holy conversation. He died at length in a good old age, and was buried at Préaux, in the church of St. Peter the apostle before the crucifix.

I propose to rest here, being fatigued with writing and having to make researches concerning events which occurred at a great distance in the far countries of the East. I shall therefore bring the sixth[4] book of my ecclesiastical history to a conclusion.

[1] Our author calls Baldric archbishop of Dol, as that prelate claimed metropolitan rights for his see, in succession from St. Simon who lived at the commencement of the sixth century.

[2] The necessity under which Baldric found himself of seeking a refuge in the midst of the turbulent Normans of the twelfth century, from the still ruder Bretons, does not give us a very high idea of the civilization of the latter.

[3] Conteville, le Marais Vernier, and St. Samson-sur-Risle, near Pont-audemer. This monastery was given to the holy bishop whose name it took by Childebert I. about the year 550, and was shortly afterwards rendered illustrious by the residence of St. Germer in it. See the lives of these two saints in the *Acta SS. ordinis Benedicti*, sæc. 1 and 2. It was still standing in 837, when it was not forgotten in the liberality of Ansegise, abbot of Fontenelles.

[4] This was in fact the sixth book in the author's original plan of his

In the seventh book,[1] if I live and am well, my Saviour, in whom I put my entire trust, being my helper, I shall give a true account of the various events, both prosperous and adverse, which happened during a period of thirty years; endeavouring, according to the best of my ability, to hand them down to posterity in their true colours. I believe that in future times there will be men, like myself, who will eagerly search the pages of historians for the acts of this generation, that they may be able to disclose occurrences which have taken place in past ages for the instruction or amusement of their cotemporaries.

work, the three first books in the present arrangement having been subsequently written.

[1] The tenth, according to the arrangement which prefixed three chapters, as just remarked.

BOOK X.

CH. I. *Death of Pope Urban II.—He is succeeded by Paschal II.—The emperors, Henry IV. and V.—Their quarrels with the popes—Henry V. marries Matilda, daughter of Henry I., king of England.*

IN the year of our Lord 1098, the sixth indiction, the Almighty Creator of all things displayed some extraordinary signs in the heavens to terrify mankind, and by such unusual appearances predict fearful events. On the fifth of the calends of October [the 27th September], the sky appeared to be on fire the whole night.[1] Afterwards, in the seventh indiction, on a Saturday on which the feast of our Lord's nativity happened to fall, the sun was eclipsed.[2] After these signs, there were changes among the rulers of the world, and terrible disasters and tumults, with severe calamities, troubled mankind. Pope Urban, after governing the apostolic see for ten years[3] with vigour and usefulness, fell sick at Rome when Jerusalem was taken, and departed out of this life on the fourth of the calends of August [24th July], going to his reward above for the good works which had distinguished him here. The lamentations of his enemies for his loss, as well as his fame spread throughout the world, attest how admirable was his life. Peter Leo has composed three elegiac couplets, recording his worth thus shortly:[4]

"Rheims claims Odo as a canon, Cluni as a monk. Rome

[1] The year 1098 appears to have been remarkable for the number of meteoric appearances. This must not be confounded with the Aurora Borealis of the month of June preceding. See before, p. 132.

[2] There was an annular eclipse of the sun at eleven in the morning of the day mentioned by our author. This passage is of great importance, as it proves that Ordericus reckoned the indiction, not from the 1st of September, with the emperors of the East, nor from the 24th of the same month, with the emperors of the West and the kings of England, but from a period of the year later than the 27th.

[3] This calculation in round numbers is not exact. Urban II. filled the papal throne eleven years, four months, and eighteen days, March 12, 1088—July 29, 1099.

[4] It is not the first, but the second, of these epitaphs which was composed by Peter de Léon. It is given more correctly in tom. viii. of the

invites him, and Ostia makes him her bishop. When as pope, he changed his name to Urban; the honour which the city had lost was restored entire. Rome has here celebated his obsequies on the fourth day before the beginning of August."

Another eminent versifier has treated of the life and death and conduct of the same pope, in the following verses:

"Odo, a canon of Rheims, who was made a monk of Cluni by [Abbot] Hugh, became an excellent pope. While he lived he was the light of Rome, when he died it was eclipsed. The city flourished while he lived, and languished at his death. O Rome! the laws which he gave you, and the peace he cherished, filled you with happiness, preserving you from vices within and from foes without. He was never swayed by the wealth of the rich, nor elated by praises and fame, nor terrified by the threats of the powerful. His tongue was remarkable for eloquence, his heart for wisdom, his conduct by worth, his carriage by dignity. Through him the way is open to the holy city;[1] our religion triumphs; the pagans are conquered; and the faith is spread through the world. As the rose, the most brilliant of flowers, is soon plucked, so fate swept off this distinguished prelate. Death possesses his mortal part, rest his soul, the tomb his corpse; nothing is left to us but his glory."

While Pope Urban was still a shining light in the house of the Lord, and engaged in expelling darkness from the hearts of men by his preaching and example, Guibert of Ravenna, who was called Clement, died,[2] and Peter Leo composed his eulogy in the following ironical verses:

Histoire Littéraire de France. It was to the palace of this powerful and wealthy nobleman the pope retired to end his days. "Urban, returning to the city after the conclusion of the council of Bari, betook himself, worn out with age and infirmities, from the Transteverine island to the neighbouring residence of Peter Leo, a powerful noble who was his intimate friend. The mansion, which is strongly fortified, stands near the church of St. Nicholas; there the pope, who had worthily filled the apostolic see, died happily on the fourth of the calends of August (29th of July), 1099."

There will be frequent opportunities of referring again to Peter Leo, and more especially to his son.

[1] By the crusade to Jerusalem.

[2] Whatever our author may say, this anti-pope survived Urban II., his death not having occurred till the beginning of October, 1100.

"Guibert! neither Rome nor Ravenna offers you an asylum; settled in neither, you are now expelled from both. You lived at Sutri,[1] a pope under sentence of excommunication. Dying, your remains are laid at Castellana.[2] You were but a name, without substance, but for your empty title, Cerberus has prepared you a place in the infernal regions."

On the death of Pope Urban, Rainier, a monk of Vallombrosa was elected pope by the name of Paschal, and canonically consecrated on the sixteenth day from the departure of his predecessor.[3] He governed the apostolical see nearly twenty years, and devoted himself with the utmost care to the service of the church of God. He visited France in the time of King Philip, and spending the feast of Easter[4] at Chartres, confirmed the privileges of that church, on the petition of the venerable bishop Ivo.[5]

The emperor, Henry IV., had disturbed the peace of holy church from his youth; had long violently usurped the right of ecclesiastical investitures, and intruded into the house of the Lord the profane adversaries of ecclesiastical unity. He was now dethroned by his son Charles, covered with disgrace for the enormity of his evil deeds, and being deserted by all his friends in his declining years, died a wretched old man on the seventh [of the ides] of August.[6] But, as for his crimes, he died under a sentence of apostolical excommunication; his corpse was suffered to decay, like that of a beast, uncommitted to the bosom of mother earth, not being permitted to receive the rites of burial common to all mankind.[7] His reign lasted nearly fifty years; but

[1] Sutri, six leagues and a half S.S.E. of Viterbo.

[2] Civita-Castellana, an episcopal city, seven leagues S.E. from Viterbo.

[3] Rainier, a native of Bleda in Tuscany, and a monk of Cluni (not Vallombrosa), afterwards abbot of St. Lawrence and St. Stephen under the walls of Rome, and a cardinal, was elected pope the 13th of August, 1099, on the nomination of his predecessor, taking the name of Paschal II. He died at Rome in the month of January, 1118, after filling the papal chair about eighteen years and a half.

[4] Easter-day, the 14th of April, 1107.

[5] This bull has not been preserved.

[6] The 7th of August, 1106, at Liége, at the age of fifty-six years, and after a reign of nearly fifty.

[7] The body of this prince was carried to Spires, where it remained five years unburied.

he received the dreadful reward of his subserviency to crime.

The emperor Charles Henry V. began his reign in the year of our Lord 1106, succeeding to his father's authority, which he held for nearly nineteen years, and "walked in the way of his father,"[1] as it is said in Chronicles of the wicked son of an iniquitous father. In the fifth year of his reign,[2] he invested Rome at the head of 30,000 cavalry, and an immense army of infantry, and having made a treaty with the Romans, was admitted by the terms of it to enter the city,[3] where by order of the pope he sat on the imperial throne in the church of St. Peter the apostle. He then requested the pontiff to celebrate mass; but he refused, unless four nobles of the imperial court who had been expressly excommunicated by him, were excluded. The emperor was so incensed that he commanded the pope to be arrested while he was standing before the altar. Upon this, one of the imperial guards laid hands on the pontiff; but one bolder than the rest of the by-standers drew his sword in imitation of Simon Peter, and smote the assailant of the pope with more resolution and effect than Peter did Malchus, for he killed the emperor's retainer with a single stroke. In consequence there was a great tumult in the city, and a cruel conflict between the two parties, in which blood was even shed in the churches, without any regard to decency. Two thousand Normans from Apulia had marched to the support of the Romans. These, united with the citizens and Latins, marched out and put to the sword vast numbers of the Germans and other people who were quartered in supposed security in the ancient city on the other bank of the Tiber. Thrice they expelled the emperor and his followers from the city; but they could not release the pope from captivity, because the place of his imprisonment was concealed. The emperor attempted to march through Rome with his

[1] A very common phrase in the book of Chronicles, applied both to good and wicked kings. The reference here is probably to 2 Chron. xxxiii. 22, *He did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, as Manasseh his father had done.*

[2] Henry V., emperor of Germany, August 7, 1106—May 23, 1125.

[3] The emperor made his entrance into Rome on the 12th of February, 1111.

troops under arms on his road to Campania, but he was resisted at the point of the sword, and compelled to retire by another way; and many had to lament the vast numbers of his troops who, as we said before, were cut off in the city.

Meanwhile, the pope, detained in close custody, and deprived of all support, yielded to the emperor's demands.[1] Having thus obtained his release, he became afterwards an object of contempt to many persons. Robert of Paris,[2] Walo bishop of Léon,[3] and Poncius abbot of Cluni,[4] and many more cardinals and prelates of churches, blamed the pope,[5] affirming without hesitation that all he had conceded to the emperor, whether verbally or in writing, was void. They declared that he ought to have been willing to die for truth and justice, following the example of Christ, with clean hands even to death, or to have submitted to imprisonment and torture, rather than yield anything to the secular power, contrary to the laws and decrees of the fathers. Pope Paschal bore the rebukes of his learned accusers with patience, confessing that their assertions were just and true. Soon afterwards he assembled a council of bishops at Rome,[6] in which all the acts which the emperor had obtained from him under coercion, were plainly condemned, under the advice of the jurisconsults, and the emperor was excommunicated for his profanation of the house of God, and imprisonment of the servant of Christ, and effusion of Christian blood. It was thus that the emperor, in the sixth year of his reign, soiled the glory of Latium by these great crimes, and disturbed to no purpose many nations by his attempt to commit such enormities. An Irish scholar has written a

[1] The preceding paragraph contains many inaccuracies. It may, however, suffice to remark that the bull by which the pope granted the emperor's demands in the matter of the investitures, bears date the 11th of April, and that he crowned Henry on the day following.

[2] Robert of Paris appears to have been distinguished for his skill in dialectics. See *Hist. de France*, t. xii. p. 3.

[3] Gualon, bishop of St. Pol-de-Léon, was present at two dedications made by Calistus II., in 1119.

[4] Pontius, abbot of Cluni, will be mentioned again in the sequel.

[5] Our author omits mentioning, among the most violent enemies of the pope, Geoffrey, abbot of Vendôme and a cardinal, and especially Bruno, bishop of Signi and abbot of Monte Cassino, the most determined of all.

[6] The 28th of March, 1112.

satisfactory narrative,[1] in which he relates how severe and dangerous were the storms, the snow and the ice of that winter, what perils and difficulties the army had to encounter in narrow and mountainous defiles, and how the emperor, having collected his forces and sat down before Rome, reduced the city more by threats than by arms.[2] In that expedition the emperor attacked Milan, but was repulsed, gaining no advantage. He then also ravaged the extensive territories of the powerful countess Matilda who possessed Ticinum,[3] Placentia, and all that large portion of Italy now called Lombardy, having long resolutely opposed the emperor and his father, and supported the legitimate popes Gregory, Urban, and Paschal.[4]

Henry, king of England, gave his daughter Matilda in marriage to the emperor,[5] and she was conducted on the journey from England to Germany by Roger, son of Richard, a cousin of the king's,[6] with a brilliant suite. The wealthy king bestowed with his daughter a dowry of ten thousand marks, besides royal gifts to his son-in-law. The emperor

[1] It is probable that David Scotus was a native of Scotland, the confusion between the Irish and Scotch being common in the middle ages. He was first a scholar at Hurtzburg, then chaplain to Henry V., and afterwards preferred to the see of Bangor, which he held from 1120 to 1139. His narrative, divided into three books, appears to be still extant in MS., in the imperial library at Vienna, although it is not mentioned in Endlicher's Catalogue. It is probably the same work, which also appears in MS. in the catalogue of the library of All Souls Coll., Oxon, under the title of *Historia Henrici V.* Its real title appears to be, *Iter sive Expeditionis Series*, &c. William of Malmesbury quotes this "Progress to Rome" in the fifth book of his Chronicle (p. 458 in *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.*), but he says that "it is far more partial to the king [emperor] than becomes an historian," and is "not a history, but a panegyric." See also Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis*, t. ii. p. 16.

David Scotus is mentioned with little respect in the Annals of Winchester, which represent him as a native of Wales: "In the year 1120, Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated one David, a Welshman, to the see of Bangor.

[2] After having passed the Alps, in the month of August, 1110.

[3] Pavia.

[4] The Countess Matilda died the 24th of July, 1115, and the emperor again passed the Alps to take possession of her fiefs.

[5] Matilda, daughter of Henry I., was betrothed to the emperor Henry V., in 1109, but the marriage was not celebrated till the 7th of January, 1114.

[6] Roger de Bienfaite, or de Clare, whose father, Richard, was cousin-german of William the Conqueror.

was much attached to his illustrious wife, but for his sins he was not permitted to have any issue to succeed to the empire. The imperial crown therefore, by God's will, was transferred to another family,[1] for at his death, Lothaire, duke of Saxony, was elected by the nobles of the realm, and for his temperance and excellence raised to the throne. After her husband's death, the empress Matilda returned to her native country, preferring to live among her own people, though she was much beloved abroad. The king of England, her father, afterwards married her to Geoffrey count of Anjou; and she bore her husband a son, named Henry, in the year of our Lord 1133,[2] who is looked upon by many nations as their future sovereign, if Almighty God, the disposer of all events, shall so ordain.

CH. II. *Reign of William Rufus—His character—Conduct of ecclesiastical affairs—Promotions to English bishoprics.*

HAVING somewhat digressed from the subject I have taken in hand, and dwelt a little on events which happened, beyond the Alps, in Italy and Palestine, it is now time for me to return to our own affairs, of which Normandy and England were the theatre.

William Rufus, a warlike prince, succeeded to the throne of England at his father's death; he firmly repressed rebellions against his authority, and for twelve years and ten months kept all his subjects in submission to his rule. He was liberal to his military men and to foreigners, but the poor natives of his realm were severely oppressed, and he exacted from them what he so prodigally bestowed on strangers. During his reign many of his father's nobles died, who had acquired in his wars honours beyond any they inherited from their ancestors, in whose place the king substituted men of low rank who raised themselves to

[1] At the death of Henry V. the imperial dignity was lost by the house of Franconia, which had enjoyed it since 1024, and passed to Lothaire II., duke of Saxony.

[2] The empress Matilda was betrothed to Geoffrey Plantagenet, count of Anjou, on Whitsunday the 22nd of May, 1127. The prince to whom she gave birth on the 25th of March, 1133, was afterwards King Henry II., whose high destinies are predicted by our author.

It is clear that this paragraph, and consequently the whole of book x., could not have been written before the summer of 1133, unless the passage was inserted afterwards, which the appearance of the MS. by no means indicates.

eminence, as the reward of their flatteries. William Rufus was never married, having abandoned himself without restraint to lewdness and debauchery, setting his subjects a fatal example of gross lasciviousness. On the death of the bishops and abbots, the king's officers seized their ecclesiastical possessions and all their wealth, which for three years and upwards were held by the king. Thus for the sake of the revenues which the king's avarice gathered into his treasury, the churches were suffered to remain vacant, and, deprived of their proper pastors, the Lord's flock were exposed to the ravages of the wolves.

At this time the venerable bishops, Osmund of Salisbury[1], Walkelin of Winchester,[2] William of Durham,[3] Remi of Lincoln,[4] and several other reverend prelates died, whose rents and property were for a long time in the hands of Flambard and his brother Fulcher.[5] So also, on the death of Baldwin, abbot of the holy king and martyr St. Edmund[6],

[1] He died the 3rd of December, 1099.

[2] Walkelin, bishop of Winchester, 1071—1098.

[3] William, bishop of Durham, died the 2nd of January, 1096. He was surnamed de St. Calais, because he had been a monk of that abbey, and afterwards abbot of St. Vincent-du-Mans. Nominated to the bishopric of Durham by William the Conqueror, November 9, 1080, he was consecrated at Gloucester, the 3rd of January, 1081. King William Rufus made him great-justiciary of England, and heaped benefits upon him, which did not prevent him from betraying his benefactor, and joining the conspiracy of the bishop of Bayeux, the result of which obliged him to take refuge in Normandy. In the month of September, 1091, William restored him his bishopric, while he was at Durham on his expedition against the king of Scots. The bishop's return to England was fatal to the peace of the church, as he never ceased fomenting the quarrel between the king and St. Anselm, in the hope of one day obtaining the primacy in his place.

[4] Remi was a monk of Fécamp, and attended William the Conqueror to England. He was rewarded with the bishopric of Lincoln (1072—1092), the seat of which he removed from Dorchester to the city which gave its name to the see. Henry of Huntingdon, who was a canon of Lincoln, gives him a high character. See his works in *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.* pp. 220 and 304.

[5] See before, vol. ii. p. 467. These worthies will also appear again on the stage, when we shall witness the injury and scandal they occasioned to the church of Lisieux, after their expulsion from England.

[6] Baldwin, abbot of St. Edmondsbury. He was originally a monk of the royal abbey of St. Denys, and was removed from it as long before as 1065, and consequently before the conquest, to undertake the government of St. Edmondsbury, which he held for thirty-two years, to the 29th of December, 1097, the period of his death.

and Simeon of Ely[1] and other abbots, the king's officers seized the monasteries through the whole of England with all that belonged to them, supplying the monks with a very moderate allowance of food and clothing, and paying the surplus of the revenues into the royal treasury. At last, after a considerable time, the king conferred these ecclesiastical dignities on clergy or monks who were about his court, as if they were mere stipendiaries, promoted not for their religion but for the obsequiousness of their services in secular affairs.

Thus Robert Bloet,[2] who had been chaplain to William the elder, and had sailed with William the younger from the port of Touque, being the bearer of the king's letter to Archbishop Lanefranc respecting the coronation of his son,[3] was after the death of Bishop Remi promoted to the see of Lincoln, which he held more than twenty years. Gerard, nephew of Walkelin, bishop of Winchester, was first made bishop of Hereford, and afterwards, in the reign of king Henry, created archbishop of York.[4] William de Guarel-Guest had the bishopric of Exeter.[5] John the Physician, Bath,[6] Ralph, surnamed Luffa, Chichester,[7] Ranulph Flambard, Durham,[8] and Herbert Losing, Thetford.[9] Thus the

[1] Simeon, abbot of Ely, brother of Walkelin, bishop of Winchester, was first prior of that cathedral, and afterwards forced upon the monks of Ely against their will in 1081. He died at the age of upwards of one hundred years in 1093.

[2] Robert Bloet, bishop of Lincoln, 1093—January 10, 1123. He was Henry of Huntingdon's patron. See his account and character of the bishop, Works, pp. 250 and 302—304, *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.*

[3] We learn from this passage the strange detour made by William Rufus at the moment of his father's death (vol. ii. p. 414), in choosing Touques as his port for embarking on his voyage to England, instead of one of those on the coast of Normandy lying more directly opposite.

[4] Gerard, bishop of Hereford, about 1095, translated to the archbishopric of York in 1100.

[5] William de Warlewast, bishop of Exeter, 1107—1127 or 1137. See note at the beginning of the next chapter.

[6] John the Physician, bishop of Bath, 1088—December 29, 1122.

[7] Ralph, bishop of Chichester, 1091—1123.

[8] Ranulf Flambard, bishop of Durham, May 29, 1099—September, 1128.

[9] Herbert Losing, or *the flatterer*. This prelate, who was a native of the Hiemois, was distinguished by acts more scandalous than his flatteries, not only having bought his bishopric, but also the abbey of Winchester for his father. In 1095 the see was removed from Thetford to Norwich. He died the 22nd of July, 1149.

king's chaplains and favourites obtained the bishoprics of England, and some of them made use of their appointments only to oppress the feeble and amass wealth. Others, however, were inspired by divine grace with a deep sense of the responsibility of the government of the church which they had undertaken, and devoted themselves to profit the flocks committed to their charge, both in spiritual and temporal things, while they laudably amended their own lives according to the divine will. Men commit many crimes to obtain their ends, never satisfied unless they gain them through a course of wickedness; but the wise Disposer of events in his wonderful mercy orders all for the benefit of the world. Very often thoughtless and unlearned men are advanced to the government of the church, not for their holiness of life, or acquaintance with ecclesiastical doctrines, or knowledge of letters, but on account of their noble parentage, and in compliment to their powerful friends. But the merciful God spares and compassionates even such as are thus promoted, inspiring them subsequently with the fulness of divine grace, and illuminating through them the house of God with the light of heavenly wisdom, so that by their useful labours many are saved.

CH. III. *St. Anselm goes into exile—Received by Pope Paschal, at Rome—Is present at the council of Clermont, and at that of Bari.*

THE venerable Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, seeing that iniquity prevailed, was often in great tribulation, and after the example of John and Elijah gave frequent rebukes of what he observed with grief was contrary to the divine law. But the haughty king who disdained the wholesome restraints of his spiritual guide, was ensnared by the wicked devices of perverse counsellors, and incensed against the sound exhortations of his pious monitor. In consequence, the prudent archbishop was twice exiled during the reign of William Rufus,[1] first resorting to pope Urban, and afterwards

[2] This is a mistake. St. Anselm left England once only during the lifetime of William Rufus, on the 15th of October, 1097; he returned the 23rd of September, 1100, ten weeks after the king's death. Ralph de Diceto informs us that when St. Anselm was on the point of embarking at

to pope Paschal. His chaplain Eadmar, who attended him on his journey, has given a particular account of his exile and of his perilous travels, in a book which he published[1] on his life and character and sweet doctrines. He was accompanied by Baldwin de Tournai, a nobleman of distinction,[2] as well as by the Englishman just named, and their virtuous devotion is considered praiseworthy by those who have made themselves familiarly acquainted with the state of affairs.

Anselm found pope Urban in Apulia, and having been received with great respect, spent some time with him. Then Roger son of Tancred and count of Sicily, had entered Campania and besieged Capua, for the purpose of restoring his nephew Richard, the son of Jordan, to his paternal rights, and pressed the siege against the rebellious Lombards who had driven out the young prince. The pope offered himself as mediator, and with the assistance of the venerable Anselm, proposed conditions of peace between the contending parties. At length the count suppressed the rebellion, and restored his nephew to his former honours, and the pope

Dover, William de Warwast, the king's favourite, examined his effects in quest of money, but finding none, suffered him to depart.

On Anselm's return from his journey to Italy, he met the same envoy at Milan, whose present employment was to forbid his return to England, except on certain conditions. William Rufus's untimely end must have been near at hand when the archbishop received this last message. It is probable that this envoy of the king's is the same person who was made bishop of Exeter in 1107. A Norman by birth, he had been attached to the chapel royal from the reign of William the Conqueror, and employed in several missions. He was probably born at a place now called Veraval, in the commune of Hotol-le-Vatois, and canton of Fauville. In the 13th century the name was called Warawast, and also Werelwast. The owners of this fief are often named in the chartulary of St. Wandrille, of which abbey Werawast and Hoto formed part of the domains.

[1] *Eadmeri, Cantuarensis monachi, sancti Anselmi vita, labore et studio D. Gabrielis Gerberon. Paris*, 1675, at the end of the same author's edition of the works of St. Anselm.

[2] This person was a monk in whom St. Anselm reposed entire confidence, and who was entrusted with the care of his household as soon as he was promoted to the archbishopric. In 1095 William Rufus expelled him from England out of hatred to the archbishop. It is not supposed that he was a native of Tournay in Flanders, nor of a place of the same name in the department of the Orme, but of the hamlet of Tournai, in the commune of Harcourt and Thibouville, near Bec. He accompanied St. Anselm to Rome in 1098.

recommended to him the lord Anselm, and the count to the archbishop.[1] A council being convened at Bari, by the pope's order, and a number of difficult questions brought forward by the Greeks concerning the faith and other mysteries, father Anselm, by the pope's command, made a sermon addressed to them all, and satisfied the Greeks as well as the Latins by his subtle and luminous replies to the several propositions.[2] When this pope performed his apostolical duties to God and the Christian world, and determined to confer spiritual benefit on the people of France, of which he was a native, he held a great council at Clermont, a city of Auvergne,[3] at which he exhorted the faithful to war against the infidels, and established the custom of wearing on the shoulder the cross of Christ as a protection against the devil and every evil spirit. It was then that the extraordinary movement of the people, described in the last book took, place.

Then Godfrey, duke of Lorraine, mortgaged the castle of Bouillon with all its appurtenances to the bishop of Liège, his lord, receiving from him seven thousand silver marks.[4] In the same manner, others both rich and poor, made away with their lands and possessions to raise money for the Jerusalem enterprise.

[1] This account is not exact. St. Anselm did not join Urban II. under the walls of Capua, that pope having received him at Rome, and entertained him two days in the palace of the Lateran. It was at the request of Count Roger that, sometime after his arrival at Rome and his retirement to the Terra del Lavoro, he came to his camp near Capua, where the pope did not arrive till two days afterwards. The service which Roger rendered to his cousin Richard was not quite as disinterested as our author seems to have thought; for the prince of Capua was only restored to his capital on condition of holding it under Roger.

[2] The council of Bari was opened the 13th of October, 1098, and not 1099, as stated from the local historians in the note vol. ii., p. 394.

[3] There is an anachronism in this passage, or the order of events is transposed. The council of Clermont, which was opened on the 18th of November, 1095, was anterior, by three years, to the events of which our author has just spoken.

[4] Godfrey of Bouillon neither sold nor mortgaged, as it has has been often asserted, the castle of Bouillon, which was the property of his mother, who survived him.

CH. IV. *The administration of Normandy in the duke's absence by William Rufus—Death of Odo, bishop of Bayeux—Some ecclesiastical appointments.*

ROBERT II., duke of Normandy, who was humourously surnamed Curthose, demised all his territories for five years to his brother King William, and received from him ten thousand marks of silver for the expenses of the pilgrimage to which he had devoted himself. King William, in the ninth year of his reign, being loath to exhaust his treasury, seized the ornaments of the churches, which the pious zeal of former kings and nobles had enriched with gold and silver and jewels, and bestowed on holy mother church to the glory of God, and for a remembrance of themselves. William crossed over the sea in the month of September, and obtaining possession of Normandy for the price he paid, trampled it under foot for nearly five years, that is all the rest of his life. Then Odo, bishop of Bayeux, undertook the pilgrimage with his nephew Duke Robert, for there was so much ill will between him and the king on account of their former quarrels, that it could not be appeased by any mediators. The king was haughty and passionate, and had a good memory, not easily forgetting, and suffering to pass unrevenged, any injury he received. The proud prince therefore bitterly recollected that bishop Odo, his uncle, had been the first to oppose him in the beginning of his reign and had excited an extensive revolt of the nobles against him. At his instigation, Robert, earl of Morton, had held Pevensey, but afterwards being besieged by the king, who was his nephew, he made peace with him, and surrendering the castle, returned to his allegiance. Gilbert Fitz-Richard, also, with his brother Roger, fortified Tunbridge, but the king besieged the fortress in Easter week, and it was given up to him on the first assault. Lastly, the bishop himself, with Eustace, count of Boulogne, Robert de Belèsme and a gallant force, held the castle of Rochester, until, being blockaded by two forts which the king erected, he was forced to make an ignominious capitulation, and to depart from the realm of England with the forfeiture of all his possessions.[1] Afterwards in Normandy, when the king

[1] Our author has related these occurrences in b. viii. c. ii. See vol. ii. pp. 433—443.

sought for revenge and retaliated on his brother the unjust and fruitless attack he had received from him, triumphantly getting possession of great part of the duchy, through the fear or the covetousness which attached the barons to his cause, Odo, bishop of Bayeux, opposed him for a long time, and did not withhold his succour from the duke, until he was wanting to himself. In consequence, when the bishop found that King William was master, as we have before related, he preferred rather to undertake the pilgrimage than to submit to his enemy. The bishop and the duke had a conference at Rome with Pope Urban, and having received his benediction, crossed the Tiber, and wintered in Apulia.

From thence the bishop retired to the city of Panormo, commonly called Palermo, where he died in the month of February, and was buried in the church of St. Mary, mother of God, by Gilbert, bishop of Evreux. Odo was early promoted, becoming when young governor of the church which he ruled for nearly fifty years. He added to the honours and ornaments of his cathedral, respected the clergy, and depriving numbers of their property was liberal of what he took from others.[1] As soon as King William heard of his death, he gave the bishopric to Thorold, son of Hugh de Envermou, who resigned it seven years afterwards for some secret motives, and submitted himself to the monastic rule under Abbot William at Bec, where he served God a long time in the regular discipline to the end of his days.[2] He was succeeded in the see of Bayeux by Richard, son of Sampson, who filled it twenty-six years.[3]

[1] See vol. ii. pp. 428—431.

[2] Thorold d'Envermeu, brother of Hugh d'Envermeu, who granted the priory of St. Laurent of that name to the abbey of Bec. Circumstances as mysterious to us as they were to our author not only induced him to resign his bishopric at the end of seven years, but even presented canonical obstacles to his taking possession, which he does not appear to have done. Still he was a worthy person, honoured with the friendship and correspondence of St. Anselm. After his resignation, he retired to the abbey of Bec. He was there miraculously cured of hernia, and his life prolonged till 1146. This passage of our author appears not to have been written till after his death, at least it was not till after that of his successor.

[3] It will appear hereafter that this Bishop Richard died in Easter week, 1133. He gave the barony of Dover (DOBRA), of which he was proprietor, to the church of Bayeux. His liberality, also, materially assisted in the foundation of the priory of Plessis-Grimoult.

King William thus possessed Normandy, having secured to himself the territories of his father, which his brother had foolishly alienated. He committed the churches which were deprived of their pastors by death to rulers chosen according to his own will; for the abbeys of Jumièges and Dives were both vacant. Gontard, the famous abbot of Jumièges, died at Clermont on the sixth of the calends of December [26th November], while the celebrated council was held there. The king appointed in his place Tancard, provost of Fécamp, who, some years afterwards, retired with infamy in consequence of a disgraceful quarrel between him and the monks. He was succeeded by Ursus of Rouen, who had been a monk of the same house from his childhood, and was abbot for twenty years.[1] Meanwhile Fulk, a monk of St. Evroult and abbot of Dives, went to Pope Urban, and became an exile at Monte Cassino. His successor Benedict, who had been a monk of St. Ouen, archbishop of Rouen, having died, King William appointed Etard, who had been gardener at Jumièges, and a monk there from childhood, abbot of Dives, and he diligently fed the flock of Christ for several years. But when Fulk returned, under the pope's protection, he willingly resigned the government of the abbey, and, returning to the place where he made his first profession, spent the rest of his life there, until he died in extreme decrepitude. Fulk, who had rigorously governed the abbey of Dives for twenty years before he was deposed, and by his ability much increased the number of the monks, and been serviceable to the church in a variety of ways, having been unjustly accused and deposed by the instigation of the devil, was exiled for seven years.[2] On his return, resuming the government of his abbey, he conducted it prosperously for a further period of seven years, and died at Winchester, in the decline of life, on the third of the nones [3rd] of April.

[1] The expulsion of Tancard appears to have taken place in 1104. Ursus, his successor, died the 27th of October, 1127, accompanied to his grave by universal regrets.

[2] Our author has already supplied us on several occasions with accounts of the quarrels of this troublesome person with his monks. He is believed to have died at Winchester, the 3rd of April, 1106.

CH. V. *William Rufus asserts pretensions to the French Vexin—Builds the fortress of Gisors—Makes an irruption into France as far as Pontoise.*

IN the year of our Lord 1097, the fifth indiction, William Rufus, having considered his father's acts and the causes of his wars, claimed of Philip, king of France, all the country of the Vexin, demanding possession of the noble castles of Pontoise, Chaumont, and Mantes. The French were so far from acceding to these demands, that they burnt with ardour to resist the invader, so that bloody hostilities broke out between the two fierce nations, which involved numbers in sad destruction. The whole burden of the war fell on the French nation, for their king, Philip, was fat and lazy, and altogether unfit for military service, while his son Lewis was as yet unqualified for it in consequence of his tender years.[1] Whereas the sovereign of England was devoted to arms, making distinguished warriors his principal friends, and surrounding himself with chosen bands of gallant knights. At the head of such troops, if Caius Julius Cæsar himself, with his Italian legions, had attacked him and attempted to do him any injustice, William Rufus would doubtless have dared to try the courage and daring of his troops in close combat with the Roman. Robert de Belèsme was appointed commander of the king's forces, enjoying the royal favour in an especial manner, and being eminent for his abilities. The illustrious count Henry, the king's brother, Hugh earl of Chester,[2] and Walter Giffard, earl of Buckingham,[3] with several other counts, captains, and officers, led the troops of the king of England, and as

[1] Our author's account must not be taken literally. Doubtless, Louis-le-Gros was not in 1097 in a state to make head for any length of time against so formidable an enemy as William Rufus; but as he was nineteen or twenty years of age, and commanded a French army, it is not correct to describe him as too young to bear arms. It will be seen presently that notwithstanding the incontestable superiority of the king of England in every way, the success of the campaign was balanced between the contending parties.

[2] Hugh, earl of Chester, must have been far advanced in years and incapable of exertion in 1097; he died in 1104.

[3] He died in 1102.

variable fortune permitted, often distinguished themselves by their gallant deeds.

Most of the French, called on to obey two lords for the rich fiefs which they held under both kings, and being in great trouble because no man can serve two masters, chose the more enterprising and wealthy of the kings, and placed their vassals and castles at his disposition. Thus Robert, count of Mellent, received English garrisons into his fortresses, and giving them ready access into the French territory, their irruptions caused great losses to that nation. Guy de-la-Roche-Guion[1] also favoured the English for their money, and put into their hands his castles of Roche-Guion and Veteuil. Several others did the same, deserting their countrymen to act with zeal in the cause of strangers. Then King William caused a very strong fortress to be constructed at Gisors, which serves to this day as a bulwark to Normandy against Chaumont, Trie, and Bouri.[2] Robert de Belèsme selected the site, and directed the works like a skilful engineer. One day, when the Normans had attacked the French, who did not shrink from the combat, Theobald-Paganus of Gisors,[3] Walter d'Amfreville,[4] and Gerold

[1] Guy, lord of la Roche-Guion and Veteuil. He was brother of Richard de Vernon, and probably gave his name to la Roche-Guion.

[2] All places in the French Vexin, close to Gisors.

[3] Theobald-Paganus, castellan of Gisors and Neaufle, and father-in-law of Richard de Montmorenci, lord of Bantelu.

[4] There are no less than eight communes of the name of Amfreville, in Normandy. That which gave birth to the person here mentioned is probably Amfreville-sur-Iton, which was held by successive lords of the name of Simon, and taking their surnames from the fief, in the 13th and 14th centuries. The Walter d'Amfreville mentioned in the text, gave a moiety of an estate he held at Miserei, under the counts of Evreux, to the abbey of Jumièges.

According to the English genealogists, the chief of this family was Robert de Umfraville, lord of Toures, and kinsman of William the Conqueror, who, they say, received from that king the lordship of Kiddesdale in the county of Northumberland. His son Gilbert was contemporary with Henry I. A member of this family, of the same name, was earl of Angus in Scotland, at the close of the 13th century, and transmitted this title to his descendants, who kept it till 1384. The name of Umfraville often appears in the *Monasticon Anglicanum*.

There is only one place in Normandy whose name resembles Toures, and that is Tour, in the canton of Trevières; but it lies far distant from all

d'Envermeu,[1] were taken prisoners, whose rich ransoms inspired the French, who were not wealthy, with ardour for the fight. Robert de Maldestor,[2] Odmund de Chaumont,[3] Walbert de Bouri,[4] and Richard his brother, with Godfrey, and Peter, sons of Herbert de Serrans,[5] were at the head of the troops of the Vexin, and sometimes had sharp engagements with the enemy. That province supplies a great number of excellent soldiers, distinguished for their intelligence and valour. They would not suffer the glory of the French name to be lost, and resisted the enemy to the death in defence of their country and national honour. In consequence the flower of the French chivalry flocked to their standard from all parts of the country, and won rich spoils in frequent encounters with the enemy.

On one occasion, when the followers of the English king were ravaging the neighbourhood of Chaumont, and the daring enterprise of the knights was exhibited on both sides, the French made prisoners of Gilbert de Laigle, and several others of high rank, while the English took

the Umfravilles, and belonged to the bishop of Bayeux in spirituals and the chamberlain of Tancarville in temporals. M. Le Prevost suggests that for Toures we should read Tourville, a domain contiguous to the principal seat of the lords of Amfreville-la-Campagne, from whom Gilbert was probably descended.

This Walter d'Amfreville appears three times on the pipe-roll of the 31st year of Henry I., for acquittances of the Danegeld and other taxes in the counties of Essex, Suffolk, and Cornwall.

[1] Probably a relation of Hugh and Thorold d'Envermeu, mentioned not long before, see p. 206.

[2] Maudétour, near Magni. In 1169, Robert de Maldestor, probably a grandson of the one here mentioned, was witness to a charter of Lewis-the-Young in favour of Jumièges. In 1193, Hugh de Maldestort was constable of the Vexin.

[3] Odmund-le-Vieux, son of Robert, lord of Chaumont in the Vexin. His name and those of his posterity will occur again.

[4] Walbert de Bouri was not the head of the family, but his eldest brother Eustace, who in 1104, gave the church of Bouri to St. Martin of Pontoise. Walbert joined in the grant. He was dead in 1105, when his son Ralph restored to the archbishop of Rouen the lands dependent on Gisors which they had detached from the see, for which both father and son were excommunicated.

[5] Serans-le-Bouteiller near Magni. The father of these two persons is mentioned before (vol. i., p. 457) as one of the benefactors of the priory of la Chapelle, in the Vexin.

Paganus de Montjai[1] with other knights from the same quarter.

In the year of our Lord 1098, the sixth indiction, in the month of September, King William collected a large army, and on his march into France rested at Conches on the fifth of the calends of October [27th September]. The same night a fearful prodigy was exhibited to the world, the whole sky being on fire and appearing red as blood to the inhabitants of the west. At that time, as we afterwards heard, the crusaders fought a battle with the infidels in the east, and by God's help gained the victory.[2] King William carried his irruption into France as far as Pontoise, devastating a noble province abounding in wealth of all kinds, with fire and pillage, and capture of the inhabitants. He likewise invested Chaumont with powerful boides of troops, and ordered it to be desperately assaulted by his well-armed soldiers. The gallant defenders of the place bravely defended their fortifications, without however forgetting what was due to the fear of God and the claims of humanity. For they mercifully spared the persons of the assailants while they vented their rage on the valuable chargers of their enemies; in this way more than seven hundred horses of great price fell by their arrows and missiles, so that the French dogs and birds of prey gorged themselves with the carrion. Many followed

[1] Paganus de Montjai, near Villevaude (Seine and Marne). He will appear again at the battle of Bremule and on other occasions.

The list of prisoners taken on either side is very different in the narrative of Suger. According to that historian, Louis-le-Gros took Count Simon, Gilbert de Laigle, a nobleman illustrious both in England and Normandy, and Paganus de Gisors, the founder of the castle of that name. The prisoners of William Rufus were, Matthew count de Beaumont, Simon de Montfort, and Paganus de Montjai.

It is most probable that the count Simon, made prisoner by the French, was Simon de Senlis, who was earl of Huntingdon in right of his wife Matilda.

The captivity had very different results for the warriors of the two armies. The wealthy king of England ransomed his partisans without loss of time, but the finances of Louis-le-Gros did not allow of his doing the same. In consequence, the French were kept prisoners a long time and escaped from it on condition of swearing fealty to the king of England and engaging in his service.

[2] We have no information that any important event of the first crusade coincided with this phenomenon, whatever may have been the case with respect to that in the month of June, 1098, mentioned in the note p. 193.

the king homewards on foot who had crossed the Epte mounted on spirited horses. Although the valiant French were unable to defend their farms and villages from the predatory excursions of the king's troops, whose numbers were great, nor risk a regular engagement, without a king or general, against a powerful monarch at the head of a large army, they defended their fortresses with great obstinacy, and, putting their trust in the goodness of God, waited for better times. Meanwhile, King William, accompanied by William count of Poitou,[1] led a large army, under the command of the young Amauri,[2] and Nivard de Septeuil,[3] against Montfort and Epernon, ravaging all the surrounding country. However, Simon-the-Young,[4] by God's help, saved his castles from injury. Simon-the-Elder defended Neaufle,[5] and Peter, with his sons Arnold and Theobald stoutly maintained themselves at Maule,[6] as did also other lords of castles whose names I cannot furnish individually. Meanwhile, King William being recalled to England by affairs in his kingdom, a truce was concluded on both sides, and the cessation of hostilities restored to the French the satisfaction arising from a feeling of security.

Ch. VI. *Magnus III., king of Norway—His family—Expeditions to the Orkneys and Western islands, to Man, Anglesey, and Ireland—Hugh, earl of Shrewsbury, killed by him—His son King Sigurd's adventurous crusade.*

In the year of our Lord 1090, Magnus, son of Olaf, king of Norway,[7] having taken arms against the Irish, prepared to

[1] William VII., surnamed le Vieux, count of Poitiers.

[2] Amauri, who afterwards became lord of Montfort-l'Amauri, and in the end count of Evreux.

[3] Nivard de Septeuil, near Mantes.

[4] Simon the Young, lord of Montfort, before his brother.

[5] Probably Neaufle-le-Château, near Montfort. Simon the Elder must have been a collateral kinsman, probably uncle to Simon the Younger and Amauri.

[6] See a long account of Peter de Maule and his sons, vol. ii. pp. 220, 221, &c.

[7] Magnus III., king of Norway, succeeded his father Olaf Kyrre in 1093. He received the surname of *Barfæd*, Barefoot, or bare legs, from his having adopted the national dress of the Highlanders during his expedition to the Western islands; "he and his people," as the Sagas relate, "going about the streets with bare legs and short kirtles and overcoats."

attack them with a naval expedition of sixty ships. Magnus was strong and handsome in person, of a bold and liberal disposition, brave and active, and endowed with many virtues. His power extended over the islands in the ocean, and he was possessed of great wealth and abundant resources of all kinds. He had two sons born in lawful wedlock, Eystein and Olaf, to whom he bequeathed his kingdom and wide dominions. He had a third son named Sigurd, by an English woman, a captive of noble birth, who was educated by Thorer, son of Ingerid, the foster-father of King Magnus.[1] On the death of his brothers he succeeded to the throne which he filled for many years, and founded bishoprics and monasteries in Norway, establishments unknown there in the times of his predecessors.

Before he came to the throne Sigurd had undertaken a naval expedition to the Holy Land, and blockaded by sea the rich city of Tyre which stands on the coast, while the crusaders from Jerusalem besieged it on the land-side.[2]

The kilt or philibeg and plaid appear therefore to have been in use in the Hebrides in 1099.

[1] King Magnus Barfod married Margaret, the daughter of Inge, king of Sweden, but his three sons who succeeded him, Sigurd, Eystein, and Olaf, were all born before this union, of different mothers, and, as it would appear, concubines. If Sigurd's mother was "an Englishwoman," as our author states, she was probably, from her name Thora, of Anglo-Norwegian extraction. Her guardian, Thorer, son of Ingerid (*Turer Ingherriæ filius*), a sister of Olaf, saint and king, although he had been the foster-father, *nutritius*, of Magnus Barfod, was hanged in his old age in the presence of that king for revolting against him.

Not only were the sons of Magnus "not born in lawful wedlock," but all three, not "two" of them, divided his dominions between them; Sigurd succeeding to the southern districts, with the Orkney and other islands of which he had been declared king in his father's life-time (1098), Eystein having Trondhjem (Drontheim) and the northern provinces (1103—August 29, 1127), and Olaf the central districts of Norway (1103—Dec. 1, 1116). Eventually, on the death of his brothers, Sigurd succeeded to the whole, and died in 1130.

[2] Sigurd's voyage to the Holy Land took place, contrary to our author's assertion, after he had become king both of Norway and the Orkneys. He acquired from it the surname of JORSALAFARE, the pilgrim to Jerusalem. His romantic adventures in the East kindled the inspiration of the Icelandic Skalds, several of whom he entertained at his court. His Saga in the Heimskringla supplies us with full details of the expedition, and enables us still further to correct some of our author's statements. Sailing for England "with sixty long ships," he wintered there (1107, 1108) with

Returning to Norway by way of Russia, Sigurd married Malfrid the king's daughter, and reaching his own country, by God's will, shortly afterwards succeeded to the throne.[1]

There are five cities standing on the sea-coast surrounding Norway, Berga,[2] Cuneghella, Copenga, Burgus, and Alsa.

Henry, son of William the Bastard, who was then king." The poem opens with these spirited lines :—

"The king is on the waves
The storm he boldly braves.
His ocean steed,
With winged speed
O'er the white-flashing surges,
To England's coast he urges;
And there he stays the winter o'er:
More gallant king ne'er trod that shore."

In the following spring the Norse hero ravaged the coasts of Spain and Portugal, then in possession of the Saracens, having first defeated a squadron of Moorish pirates ; and passing the straits of Gibraltar, where, as well as on the African coast and at Ivica and Minorca, he again had actions with "the heathen," he was entertained as a fellow countryman by Roger, the Norman count of Sicily so often mentioned in this work. Landing at Acre, Magnus completed his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, where he was honourably received by Godfrey, and assisted him in the siege of Sidon, not Tyre, as Ordericus states. Sigurd returned home by Constantinople, where Alexius paid him the highest honours. Presenting his fleet to the emperor, he journeyed by land through Bulgaria, Hungary, and Suabia, where he met the emperor Lothaire, and in Sleswig was entertained by Nicholas, king of Denmark. The expedition occupied three years, and Sigurd was only twenty years old when he returned to his own dominions. —*Laing's Heimskringla*, vol. i. pp. 149—162.

[1] "Sigurd married Malmfrid, a daughter of King Harald Waldemarson (Wladimir-Wsewolowitsch, grand duke of Russia), eastward in Novogorod," says the Saga already referred to, but it does not appear that he returned to Russia after his crusade, as our author states, and that the marriage took place at that time.

[2] *Bergen*, formerly a capital and still the most important commercial city in Norway. Olaf Kyrre, the peaceful king, Sigurd's grandfather, "founded a merchant town there (in 1070), where soon many wealthy people settled, and it was regularly frequented by merchants from foreign lands." (Saga.) He granted it great commercial privileges, and its trade vastly increased when it became a member of the Hanseatic league.

Cunegalla, the Konüngahella, Kongehelle, or Konghel, of the middle ages, is now called Kongelf or Kongshall. The town stands on a branch of the Gotha-elve, not far from Gottenburg. It was ceded to Sweden in 1058.

Copenga, from the Norse word *Kiobe*, merchandize, (Copenhagen having the same derivation) must mean Trondhjem (Drontheim). Its ancient

There is a sixth, called Turesberga, which is situated to the eastward towards the Danish territory. The central districts of the island contain many vast lakes, abounding in fish, and the natives are well supplied with fish and fowl and all kinds of wild game. They conform to the rites of the Christian religion, and live under strict laws by which crime is punished with the utmost severity. The Orcades, Finland, Ireland, and Greenland, which is the furthest land known to the northward, together with other islands as far as Gothland belong to the king of Norway, and the country

name was Nidaros, and it was at that time the capital of Norway, and a place of commercial importance.

Burgus is Sarpsborg, a town near the falls of the Glommen, founded by St. Olaf about the year 1090, and formerly of consequence. It was destroyed in the Swedish wars, but has been lately rebuilt by some English merchants. See Forester's Road Book for Norway, p. 415.—*Bohn's Illust. Lib.*

Alsa, Anslö, or Opslö, the change of the SL into LS being a very natural mistake of a transcriber committing to writing a foreign name and ignorant of localities. Opslö was founded in 1058 by King Harald Hardraade, who fell in battle against Harold of England at Stamford Bridge, and being destroyed by fire in 1624, its remains now form a suburb to Christiania, the modern capital of Norway.

Turesburga, another name disfigured by the transcriber, is Tönsberg, standing on a narrow branch of the Christiania Fjord, and, therefore, as our author states, on the eastern frontier of Norway. In the middle ages it was a place of great trade and importance, and one of the largest towns in Norway, but it long since fell to decay.

Finland does not mean the province on the Baltic, ceded to Russia in 1813, but Finmarken, the most northern district of Norway, reaching to the North Cape, and inhabited by a people of the race of Finns or Lapps.

Gotlandam, Gothland; our author probably includes not only the island of that name in the Baltic sea, but the province of Gothia in the south of Sweden. It was indeed one of the names given to the whole of that portion of Scandinavia in the middle ages, and the Swedish kings still retain the title of king of the Goths.

Thus interpreted, the enumeration made by our author of the dominions dependent on the crown of the Norwegian kings of that age is perfectly correct; beginning with Greenland, Iceland, and Finland, in the far north, then embracing the Orkneys to the sovereignty of which the Western Islands and those in the Irish channel was attached, and including the province of Gothia, and probably also the island of Gothland in the Baltic, with perhaps other districts of Sweden.

Our author presents us in a few short sentences with a very accurate account of the natural features of Norway, its vast lakes and pasturages, with its scattered hamlets, as well as of the primitive character and insti-

is enriched by the commercial enterprise of the Norwegians whose ships sail to every part of the world.

My mind is now bent on developing the origin and events of the war waged by King Magnus against the Irish, in which vast numbers of people perished and great losses were sustained. Magnus had married the daughter of an Irish king, but as that prince did not perform the engagements he had entered into, the king of Norway was so much incensed that he sent her back to her father.[1] This led to hostilities between them. In consequence, in the fifth year of the reign of William Rufus, king of England, Magnus assembling his forces from all quarters, and favoured by an east-wind sailed over to the Orkney-islands,[2] and rounding the northern

tutions of the people, which have been preserved with little change during the lapse of so many ages, with a particular reference to their extraordinary commercial activity in those early times. Having corrected some mistakes in the historical details, errors such as it has often been our task to point out, it is a more pleasing task to call attention to our author's unwearied industry and general merits. It is indeed surprising that a monk buried in the depths of the forests, in a remote district of Normandy, who once only in his life quitted his retirement for a visit of a few weeks to England, should at such a period, when books were scarce and communications difficult, have amassed such stores of varied and, for the most part, accurate information.

We take this opportunity, in reference to Norwegian history, of correcting an error, or rather a slip of the pen in our own annotations, which led us in vol. i. p. 464, to confound King Harald Harfaager, who flourished 853—936, with Harald Harefoot, Canute's successor, 1035—1040.

[1] There is no account of Magnus III. having married and afterwards repudiated the daughter of an Irish king, which Ordericus assigns as the cause of these hostilities; nor is there any reason to believe that the Norwegian king's marauding expedition to the Hebrides in the year mentioned by our author, 5th William Rufus (1093), extended to Anglesey and the Isle of Man, as we shall presently see.

[2] The Orkney and Shetland islands having been already colonized by the Scandinavian vikings, Harald Harfaager completely subjugated them in 895. By degrees the Norwegians also subdued and colonized the Hebrides and all the islands on the west coast, from Lewis to the Isle of Man, which they called by one name Sudeyjar, or "the southern islands," from their situation as respects the Orkneys.

King Magnus III. engaged in four successive expeditions to establish his dominion and settle colonies in these islands, some of which he extended to the coasts of Wales and Ireland,—1. In the first year of his reign (1093) it appears that he only visited the Orkneys and Hebrides. 2. In 1096, taking the same route, and touching at Iona and Isla, after rounding the peninsula of Cantire and ravaging the coasts of Scotland and Wales,

coast of Scotland, after visiting the other islands which were under his dominion, penetrated as far as the isle of Anglesey. He proposed to make a descent on Ireland, but finding that the Irish were assembled on the coast to oppose his landing, he altered his course. Sailing to the isle of Man, which was uninhabited,[1] he settled a colony on it, caused houses to be built for them, and supplied them carefully with all necessaries for their subsistence. He also visited other islands in the vast Archipelago situated I may say, beyond the circuit of the globe, causing them to be inhabited by his royal authority; and thus employed himself for several years in extending his dominions and increasing the population.

On one occasion, the commander of king Magnus's[2] forces

he advanced in his foray to Man, which he plundered. 3. In 1098—1099, the Norwegian king prolonged his expedition to the isle of Anglesey, which he reduced, it being a point further south than any of his predecessors had extended their rule. During this expedition, which also embraced Ireland, his son Sigurd, then only nine years of age, was betrothed to Biadmyrea, daughter of Moriartak, king of Connaught, and Magnus created Sigurd king of the Orkneys and Hebrides. 4. In 1102 king Magnus fitted out a great armament, and, after visiting his insular dominions, landed at Dublin, and conquering great part of Ulster, uniting his forces with his ally Moriartak, spent the winter with him in Connaught. In the spring of 1103 he was on the point of reimbarking for Norway when he was slain in a skirmish with the Irish, described in a most spirited manner in his Saga in the Heimskringla from which these notices are taken. After this disaster his son Sigurd, "leaving the Irish king's daughter behind," lost no time in returning to his own country.

Our author has not only made Magnus himself the party in this abortive union, but has confused these four expeditions into one, assigning it the date of 1093, which was that of the shortest and least important, while the main facts he has adopted are connected with the third which took place in 1098—1099.

[1] We think that our author must be incorrect in stating that Magnus found the Isle of Man uninhabited, as it would appear that it was colonized as early as the ninth century by Harald Harfaager, who placed it under the government of a Jarl, as part of his dominions; and during the tenth and eleventh centuries a long series of Norwegian kings ruled there, who were tributaries to the crown of Norway, though they aimed at independence. It was to establish his right of supremacy in Man, as well as the rest of the Sudreyjar, that Magnus Barfod undertook these expeditions.

[2] This appears to have been in the third expedition under the immediate command of King Magnus himself, and the scene of the events described was the island of Anglesey.

appeared off the English coast; but he hoisted a red shield, which is a sign of peace, at the mast head.[1] The maritime people who dwelt on the coast of the open sea towards the north of England, on seeing strange ships, with fierce crews draw near the land, raised shouts of alarm and collected bands of armed men from all quarters of the province of Mercia. There were then violent hostilities between the English and Welsh, for which reason the loud outcries called the people to arms.

Two earls who had the chief authority in Mercia, both of whom had the name of Hugh,[2] despatched messengers in breathless haste through the whole province, ordering all the men who carried arms, both French and English, to assemble without a moment's delay and defend the country against the foreign bands. In consequence, a large force was collected out of the counties of Chester and Shrewsbury, and stationed at Diganoth[3] near the sea ready for battle. Hugh de Montgomery being the first who arrived at the head of his vassals with great despatch, took up his quarters there for several days, while waiting for the auxiliaries from the neighbourhood, guarding the country with great vigilance against the irruptions of the Welsh and Norwegians. However, one day, when the inhabitants rushed to the shore in great confusion to oppose the Northmen who appeared to be preparing to attack the English from their ships, Earl Hugh, putting spurs to his horse, and getting the peop together in a body by virtue of his superior authority that they might

[1] This passage is very obscure, and it is difficult to understand what our author meant to convey; for if the red shield was a sign of peace it could not have caused the alarm he describes, but the Norwegians would have had reason to complain of the inhospitable reception they encountered. It might be supposed that the red shield was a sign of hostilities; but we must recollect that red was the national colour not only of all the Scandinavian nations, but of the kindred Anglo-Norman race. It was, probably, also that of the Welsh and ancient Britons. We may arrive at that conclusion from a passage in the prophecies of Merlin, where the Britons are distinguished by the red dragon, and the Saxons by the white. See a passage concerning these prophecies towards the close of b. xii.

[2] Hugh, earl of Chester, and Hugh de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury; they are called in the Saga of King Magnus, "Hugo the Brave, and Hugo the Stout."

[3] Diganwy; see vol. ii. p. 445, our author transferring the scene from Anglesey to the coast of Carnarvonshire.

not be cut off in detail, arrayed them against the enemy. Meanwhile, a brutal Norwegian,[1] perceiving the gallant earl thus actively riding about, suddenly shot him, alas! at the devil's instigation, with a whizzing arrow. The earl fell from his horse the same instant, breathing his last in the flowing tide. A cry of grief arose, and King Magnus hearing of this disaster joined in the lamentations, as well as those around him, and offered peace and security to Hugh Dirgane, that is, the stout.[2] "My armament," he said, "is directed not against the English, but the Irish, and my object is not to invade the country belonging to others, but to colonize the islands which are part of my own dominions."[3]

[1] The Saga relates that the earl's mortal wound was given by King Magnus himself. "King Magnus shot with the bow, but Hugo the brave was all over in armour, so that nothing was bare about him excepting one eye. King Magnus let fly an arrow at him, as also did a Halogaland man who was beside the king. They both shot at once. The one shaft hit the nose-screen of the helmet which was bent by it to one side, and the other arrow hit the earl's eye, and went through his head, and that was found to be the king's. Earl Hugo fell, and the Britons fled with the loss of many people.

"There was sung the following verse about it:—

"On the armour arrows rattle,
Where our Norse king stands in battle;
From the helmets blood-streams flow,
Where our Norse king draws his bow:
His bowstring twangs—its biting hail
Rattles against the ring-linked mail.
Up in the land in deadly strife
Our Norse king took Earl Hugo's life."

[2] *Dirgane;* probably a Norse word metamorphosed by the transcriber. We can find nothing nearer it than *diærve*, strong.

[3] Giraldus Cambrensis, who places this event in the isle of Anglesey, and in other respects coincides with the Saga, relates it very differently from our author. He says: "Pirates from the Orkneys had come into the island's sound in long ships, and the earl, hearing that they were near the shore, ventured too rashly into the sea on a strong horse to encounter them. Then the commander of the fleet, whose name was Magnus, and who was standing on the prow of his ship, shot an arrow at him, and although the earl was in complete armour of steel which entirely protected his person from head to foot, except his eyes, the arrow pierced his right eye, and penetrating the brain, he fell dead into the sea. The conqueror, seeing him fall, is said to have shouted from his lofty station in the Danish language, *Leit loupe*, which in English means, 'Let him depart.' The

The Normans and English searched a long time for the body of Hugh, and did not recover it until the ebbing tide left the strand dry. At last, seventeen days after his death, they brought it to Shrewsbury and buried it in the abbey there with deep mourning. He was the only one of Mabel's sons who was courteous and amiable, and having conducted himself with great moderation during the four years he held the family honours and domains, to which he succeeded on the death of his father Roger, he fell about the close of the month of July.

CH. VII. *Robert de Belèsme succeeds his brother as earl of Shrewsbury—Elias, count of Maine; his conference with William Rufus—The king commences hostilities against him—The Count is taken prisoner, and Maine submits to the king.*

ON the death of Earl Hugh, his brother Robert de Belèsme presented himself to William Rufus and offered him three thousand pounds sterling for his brother's earldom. Having thus secured it, he exercised great cruelties on the Welsh during four years. He built a very strong castle at Bridgnorth[1] on the river Severn, transferring the town and people of Quatford[2] to the new fortress. He also laid claim to the lands of Blythe[3] in right of his cousin Roger de

dominion of the English in Mona ended from that hour."—*Girald. Cambr.* b. ii. c. 7.

The Norse words supposed to have been used by King Magnus are, we believe, in the modern Danish-Norwegian idiom, *Lade Læbe*, let him run or leap.

[1] There was a Saxon burg or fortress at Bridgnorth built by Ethelfeda, lady of the Mercians, King Alfred's sister, as early as A.D. 912. Saxon Chron. p. 369, and Henry of Huntingdon, p. 167, of *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.* Robert de Belèsme, who was one of the most able engineers of his age, surrounded it with walls and erected the Norman fortress, which in after times stood many sieges, but no trace of it is left.

[2] There is still a place of this name, probably the site of the castle mentioned by our author which was abandoned for that of Bridgnorth, from which it is about a mile and a half distant.

[3] *Blida*; Blythe in Nottinghamshire, where Roger de Butlig founded a priory dependent on the abbey of Mount St. Catherine. The charter of foundation is preserved in the *Monasticum Anglicanum*, under the year 1088. The family sprung from Bulli, near Neufchâtel. Roger de Butlig's principal seat in England after the conquest was at Tikhill in Yorkshire. It appears in Domesday-book that he had a great many other manors. One of them, Sandford, in Devonshire, was granted by Queen Matilda to

Buthlei, and obtained a grant of them from the king for a large sum of money. But as his wealth augmented by the possession of such vast territories he was inflated with pride, and becoming a follower of Belial abandoned himself without reserve to flagitious and cruel deeds.

The English and Welsh who had long treated as idle tales the accounts they had heard of his making his cruelties a jest, now tortured in his iron grasp, felt to their sorrow that the reports were true. For the more he was aggrandized by his wealth and the number of his vassals, the more he was inflamed with cupidity to seize the lands of his neighbours whatever was their rank, and to repossess the domains which his ancestors had given to the saints. He had already forcibly erected castles[1] on the property of others in the county of Maine, I mean on the possessions of St. Peter de la Couture and St. Vincent the martyr,[2] using them for the grievous oppression of the peasants. The valiant Count Elias hearing this, he did not behave like a coward, but encountered Robert in arms on the river Roullic, in the territory of the Saonois and, invoking the holy bishop St. Julian in the name of the Lord, gave him battle, and defeated and drove him with shame from the field, although he commanded superior forces.[3] In this engagement, Robert de Courci was wounded, losing his right eye; Goulfier de Villeret, William de Moulins,[4] Geoffrey

him and his wife on their marriage, *cum uxore suâ*. His wife's name was Muriel. The male line of their descendants failed in 1213, and their possessions passed into the hands of the family of Vipont (Vieux-Pont) by the marriage of Idonea, their great-grand-daughter with Robert de Vipont.

It may be observed that Ordericus substitutes the Anglo-Saxon TH for the S or L in the original family name, written Bulli or Buslei, proving that the aspirated T was used by the Normans in the twelfth century, as it was by the ancient Scandinavians, and still is in England. Not only so, they substituted the aspirated TH for consonants of an entirely different character, as, for example, in *Brionna, Warrenna,* which they pronounced, and sometimes wrote, *Briothna, Warethna.*

[1] Saone, and St. Remi-du-Plain.

[2] The rich abbeys of La Couture and St. Vincent-du-Mans.

[3] M. Cauvin calls this rivulet Riolt or Riollet. The battle was fought between René, Toigné, and Dangeul.

[4] Eldest son of William de Moulins by his wife Aubrey. Respecting this family, see vol. ii. p. 192. The details given by our author are not very satisfactory nor consistent with each other. It does not appear why

de Gacé[1] and many others were made prisoners. The Manceaux obtained large ransoms for them, and thus avenged the outrages on the saints and their own losses. These hostilities were long continued, and caused the death or bitter captivity of numbers.

It is now convenient that I should unfold the order of events and the genealogy of a family which already aspired to the royal dignity. Elias, son of John and Paula,[2] and cousin of Hugh count of Maine, was distinguished for his piety to God, and governed his people well in the fear of the Lord. He married an illustrious lady, Matilda,[3] daughter of Gervase, who was the son of Robert surnamed Brochard,[4] brother of Gervase, archbishop of Rheims.[5] He had six brothers, the two eldest of whom, Goisbert and Enoch quitted the army to become monks. The other four Geoffrey, Lanceline, Milo and William[6] were cut off prematurely. Elias held the castle of Flèche by inheritance from his father, and obtained four castles in right of his wife, namely,

Robert, the younger son, a person of no merit, succeeded to his mother's property instead of William the elder. We have had an instance of such succession in Robert de Belèsme, inheriting the Talvas domains of his mother Mabel, and it is not uncommon in great English families. After Ordericus has told us that Simon and Hugh, cousins of the two brothers, died in their infancy, we find that Simon succeeded Robert at the age of fifteen years.

[1] Geoffrey de Gacé; perhaps a son or relation of Ralph-Tête-d'Ane. It is certain that he had a son named Robert de Gacé, who bequeathed his estates to William, Count d'Evreux, his cousin-german.

[2] On the genealogy of this person, see before, vol. ii. p. 74.

[3] Matilda, daughter of Gervase de Château-du-Loir, lady of that fief, and of Maiet, died in 1099, before Easter.

[4] Robert, son of Hammelin, and Hildeburge de Belèsme. His wife's name was Aremburge.

[5] Gervase, the third brother, after being bishop of Mans for twenty years, was made archbishop of Rheims. In this character he crowned Philip I. on May 23, 1059. He afterwards claimed the office of chancellor of France as belonging to his see, and obtained it. This prelate died July 4, 1084.

[6] It is not clear with whom our author connects these numerous brothers. If he meant Matilda, he would have done better to have joined them with Hugh de Château-sur-Loir, her brother, a person better known, who married a natural daughter of William the Conqueror, but died without issue. If it was Gervase, it is contradicted by a charter, in which he speaks of his three brothers, Adam, Robert, and Gervase, very different names from those here mentioned.

Chateau du Loire, Mayet, Luci, and Ostilli. His wife bore him a daughter named Eremburga, who, when she became marriageable, was espoused to Fulk, then Count of Anjou, and who is now king of Jerusalem, and gave birth to an illustrious progeny, Geoffrey and Elias, Matilda and Sybilla; the daughters marrying the sons of kings, but by God's providence which disposes all things well, they soon became widows.[1]

At the time when Duke Robert pledged Normandy to his brother, receiving from him a large sum of money for the expenses of his pilgrimage to the King of kings, Count Elias came to the court of William Rufus at Rouen. Having had a long conference with the duke, he presented himself to the king, and thus humbly addressed him: "My lord the king, by the pope's advice I have taken the cross in his service, and devoted myself to my Lord God for the expedition to Jerusalem with many noble pilgrims. I demand your friendship as a faithful ally, and desire to undertake this journey at peace with you." The king replied to him: "Go where you please, but yield up to me the city of Mans with the whole county, for I wish to possess all that my father held." Elias answered: "I hold the county by inheritance from my fathers, and by God's help, I will bequeath it to my children as free as I now possess it. If you choose to challenge my right, I am ready to submit to a legal judgment, and will hold or lose my inheritance according to the decision of kings, counts, and bishops." The king rejoined: "My pleadings with you shall be with swords and spears and showers of arrows." Elias then said: "It was my desire to fight against the pagans

[1] Eremburge, countess of Maine, married in 1100 Fulk V., count of Anjou, and afterwards king of Jerusalem. She died in 1126. This paragraph was written between 1131, the date of Fulk's being crowned king of Jerusalem, and 1142, that of his death. Their children were, Geoffrey Plantagenet, count d'Anjou, married to the empress Matilda; —Elias d'Anjou, count of Mans, who died in 1154.

Matilda d'Anjou, married to William Adelin at Lisieux in June, 1119, who afterwards became a nun at Fontevrault in 1128, was made abbess there in 1150, and died in 1154.

Sibylla d'Anjou, affianced in 1122 to William Cliton, and married in 1170 to Theodoric d'Alsace, count of Flanders. She died in the Holy Land at the convent of St. Lazarus at Bethany, where she took the veil, in 1158. This lady appears also to have borne the name of Mabire. Neither of her husbands were kings' sons.

in the Lord's name, but it appears that I must have a conflict nearer home with the enemies of Christ. For every one who resists the right and does injustice, proves himself to be the enemy of God, who is truth itself and the sun of justice. He has thought fit to invest me with the government of Maine, and I ought not lightly to relinquish it, lest through my folly God's people should be abandoned to robbers, like sheep who having no shepherd become the prey of wolves. Listen then, all you lords who are present, while I make known the resolution with which Heaven inspires me. I will not relinquish our Saviour's cross which I have adopted after the manner of the pilgrims, but will place it on my shield, my helmet, and all my other arms, and cause the holy sign to be fixed on my saddle and bridle. Under the protection of this divine symbol I will encounter the enemies of peace and justice, and will defend, sword in hand, the country of Christians. My horse and my arms shall be distinguished by the holy sign, so that those who fight with me will combat a soldier of Christ. I trust in Him who governs the world, and knows the secrets of my heart, and through his mercy I shall find a favourable opportunity for fulfiling my vow." King William made this reply: "Go where you will, and do what you like; I am not willing to make war against those who have taken the cross, but I will not give up a city which my father held to the day of his death. Lose no time therefore in repairing your dilapidated fortifications, hire masons and stone-cutters, who work for money, and with all speed restore the old breaches in your neglected walls. I will visit as soon as possible the citizens of Mans, appearing before the gates with a hundred thousand lances, under my standards; for I will not leave you in quiet possession of my heritage without laying claim to it. I will cause waggons drawn by oxen to convey there loads of arrows and bolts, but I will come myself to your gates with numerous troops of men at arms before the drivers can accomplish the journey with their utmost speed. Believe that I speak the truth, and let it be known to those who are in league with you."

After this conversation, the count retired and put his territories in a state of defence. The great nobles who had listened to the altercations of the warlike princes did not

venture to interfere, fearing the haughty king to whom they owed fealty, while they were sorry for the gallant count who defended his cause with firmness. Elias was brave and honourable, and dear to all for his many virtues. He was distinguished also for his personal qualities, being strong and of large stature, tall and graceful, with black curling hair, and well shaved like a priest.[1] He was agreeable and eloquent in his discourse, gentle to the peaceable and rough to the turbulent, a strict observer of justice, and zealous of good works in the fear of the Lord. His cheeks often moistened with tears showed how great was the fervour of his devotions and prayers. He employed himself diligently in defending the churches, in giving alms to the poor and in fasting, for he made every Friday a day of abstinence from meat and drink in reverence to the passion of our Lord.

Moreover, King William was occupied with many cares relating to the French, Bretons, and Flemings, so that he put off the performance of his threats for two years,[2] and forgot the Manceaux. Meanwhile, Elias fortified the castle of Dangeul[3] against Robert Talvas, and placed his retainers in it to defend the inhabitants of his territories. In consequence, that tyrant was grieved because he could not ravage the lands in his neighbourhood as he pleased. He therefore unseasonably disturbed the king in the month of January, and inflaming his anger by the violence of his language, induced him to march at the head of his army against the castle of Dangeul in the month of February. He had said to the king: "The enemy's garrison, abandoned to security, are dispersed in all quarters, trusting to the winter rains and storms, and believing you and your troops to be entangled in other military operations. If we make a sudden attack we shall find the garrison and the inhabitants unprepared, and the fortress will prove an easy conquest.

[1] This is not the first time that our author has given expression to the determined resistance made by the clergy of that age against the effeminate fashion of wearing long hair.

[2] Our author did not consider the king's short expedition against Dangeul as an adequate fulfilment of his threats the year before.

[3] Dangeul, two leagues from Mamers. The fortification of this castle was principally intended to overawe and check the excursions of the free-booters for whom Robert de Belêsme had repaired the castles of Saone and St. Remi-du-Plain.

The king engaged in the enterprise, although for many reasons he was very unwilling; but as Robert urged him and made great promises of success, he did not like to defer it lest he should be accused of want of courage. Reports of the king's march preceded him, and by the orders of the count of Maine the country people were summoned to arms and posted at the passages of the rivers, along dikes, and at the difficult entrances of the woods, for defence against the enemy. The king was thus prevented from obtaining success, but his fury was roused to the highest pitch and he commanded Robert to assemble great bodies of troops in his garrison, and supplied him with large sums of money, to enable him to fortify his castles with trenches and walls and various kinds of buildings, and to bestow large donations on his mercenary soldiers. The Count de Belèsme therefore, who was a skilful engineer, lost no time in erecting new fortresses, and adding deep ditches to the defences of the old ones. He possessed nine castles in that county, viz. Bleve, Perrie, le Monte-de-la-Nue, Saône, St. Remi-du-Plain, Lurson, Allières, la Motte-de-Gualtier-le-Clinchamp, Mamers,[1] and several other fortified houses. In this manner the cunning manœuvrer prepared castles for himself at the king's expense, placing in them ferocious garrisons, fatal to the neighbourhood, by whose means he satisfied his pride and carried on an atrocious war against the people of Mans. In the season of Lent, when sinners, inspired with divine compunction, relinquish their sins, and have recourse to penance as a remedy for their past offences, more than three hundred prisoners perished in the dungeons of Robert. They had made great offers for their ransom, but they were cruelly refused by him, and his captives perished by hunger and cold and other tortures.

At this time Hoel, by birth a Breton and bishop of Mans, died after a venerable life.[2] Count Elias nominated Geoffrey,

[1] Blèves, three leagues from Perai three leagues and a half from Mont de la Nue, near Contilli, one league and a half from Mamers; l'Ortieuse, in the commune of Val, two leagues from Saone, and two and a half from Mamers; St. Remi du Plain, two leagues and a half, Allières, one and a half, la Motte-Gautier de Clinchamp, near Chemilli, in the department of Orne, one league and a quarter from Mamers.

[2] July 29, 1097.

a Breton, and dean of the same church, to the vacant bishopric,[1] but the clergy had already compelled Hildebert de Lavaric[2] to seat himself on the episcopal throne, and sang triumphantly, with a loud voice, *Te Deum laudamus*, and the rest of the service prescribed by the church at the election of bishops. Elias, finding this, was greatly incensed and offered resistance, but the clergy saying to him, "You ought not to prefer your choice to that of the church," he was silent through respect, because he feared God; and in order not to introduce a mortal schism among the members of the church, he approved the choice of the canons.[3] Geoffrey, feeling sure of his election to the bishopric, had prepared a sumptuous banquet for the day of his elevation, and the prepared meats were not the less devoured by his greedy followers. However the people of Mans would not hear of him as their bishop. He was brother of Judicail, bishop of Aleth, and after the death of William was seventeen years archbishop of Rouen.

Hildebert was chosen by the clergy and people archbishop of Tours after the death of Gilbert, being thus translated by God's providence from the bishopric of Mans to the metropolitan see.[4] This prelate was mild, pious, and devoted to the study both of sacred and secular literature.[5] He was by far the best poet of our age, and composed a number of verses equal or superior to those of the ancients. The ardent zeal of the learned searches out these poems,

[1] Geoffrey, brother of Judicaël, bishop of St. Malo, was elevated to the archbishopric of Rouen in 1111, as we shall presently find.

[2] Hildebert, or Aldebert, a native of Larcardin, four leagues from Vendôme, had been appointed archdeacon of Mans by his predecessor Hoel in 1092.

[3] Notwithstanding the deference paid by Count Elias to the choice of the clergy of his cathedral, the new bishop, in consequence of the opposition of William Rufus and the friends of his competitor Geoffrey, was not consecrated till Christmas day of the same year. He was about forty years of age.

[4] In the beginning of the year 1125.

[5] The numerous works and correspondence of this prelate were published in 1708 by Dom Beaugendre. An analysis of them will be found in the *Histoire Littéraire de France*, t. xi. pp. 278, 412. The only ones which appear to be pointed out here are: *De querimoniâ et conflictu carnis et spiritus*, and *de quatuor virtutibus vitæ honestæ*.

and diligently studies them as more valuable than gold and topazes. He has written with elegance and wisdom concerning Christ and the church, the body and the soul, the acts of the saints and their miracles, and in praise of virtue and contempt of vice. The cardinals who frequently visit France, because they find the people civilized and obedient to their teaching, have carried back with them to Rome several of Hildebert's poems, thinking them worthy of admiration among the Roman schools and professors of eloquence. This reverend lord exercised the episcopal functions for nearly thirty-five years,[1] and was particularly devoted to useful pursuits both in practice and teaching. He worthily ornamented in a variety of ways the church of St. Gervase, where the body of Julian, the illustrious confessor of Christ reposes, and afterwards consecrated it in the time of Grumar the Breton, his successor, who is known also by his other name of Guy d'Etampes.[2] But, for their sins, what good men had exerted themselves to embellish so richly, and to furnish with various ornaments to the honour of God, became eight years after its dedication a prey to the flames, which destroyed great part of the city and polluted and ruined the church in a horrible manner.

In the year of our Lord 1098, the sixth indiction, Count Elias undertook an expedition against Robert in the week preceding the Rogations,[3] and having completed it ordered his followers to retire homewards after the nones. On their return, the count leaving his troops turned aside near Dangeul, attended by only seven horsemen and perceiving some men lurking among the thick trees and bushes, immediately charged them with his slender company. Robert himself was lying there in ambush, and, seeing the small band incautiously galloping on, that experienced and wary soldier fell suddenly upon them with superior numbers and quickly

[1] He died December 18, 1134.

[2] Guy d'Étampes (1126—1136). It appears that Grumar was the Breton form of the name of Guy, of which our author furnishes other examples. He has been supposed to have been a native of England, and it is certain that he studied there, but most probably was born in France, as he went from Mans, where he had been brought up by Hildebert, to take lessons from St. Anselm.

[3] In 1098, Rogation week commenced on Sunday, April 25.

made prisoners of the count, and Hervé de Montfort,[1] his standard bearer, with nearly all the rest. The troops in advance, after reaching Ballon[2] in high spirits, learned from those who escaped that the count was taken, and after their empty triumph were plunged into the deepest distress. Robert conducted Elias to Rouen, and presented him to the king, who committed him to honourable custody, for William was not cruel to the knights, but treated them with kindness and generosity, good humour and courtesy.

Favoured by the smiles of fortune, King William in great exultation summoned an assembly of all the barons of Normandy and thus addressed them: "Hitherto I have been very negligent in recovering my father's inheritance, because I was loth that lives should be lost and the people harassed, through my ambition to increase my territories. But now, as you see, my enemy has been taken prisoner without my knowledge, and by God's will, who knoweth the justice of my cause, is delivered to me. What course do you approve? What do you advise me to do now? Consult on what is to be done, and inform me what you consider best." The barons, having taken counsel, replied: "Our lord the king, we resolve unanimously that the whole army of Normandy be assembled at your summons, and we all will march with it boldly and cheerfully to reduce the province of Maine."

The king was much pleased at hearing this, and heralds were despatched with haste far and wide through all quarters to proclaim his will, that all his subjects, allies, and friends should come loyally to his aid. In consequence, French and Burgundians, Flemings and Bretons, and other neighbouring nations, flocked to the standard of the liberal master and greatly augmented his forces. In the month of June King William marched his army by Alençon, and entered the enemy's country at the head of a large body of troops. By his command the cavalry suddenly appeared before Frênai,[3] where they skirmished for a time with the

[1] Probably Montfort-le-Rotrou, near Conneré, now the chief town of a canton.

[2] Ballon is also the chief place of the canton of that name. The castle belonged at this time to Hammelin de Ballon, one of the favourites of William Rufus.

[3] Frênai-le-Vicomte, otherwise Frênai-sur-Sarthe.

horse belonging to the garrison at the castle-gates. Meanwhile Ralph viscount de Beaumont,[1] hastened to the king and humbly proposed a truce which he was anxious to make for the term he mentioned. "I ask a truce of your highness, my lord the king, until such time as you shall return safe from Maine. For the bishop and council are sitting there, and daily occupied in deliberations for the common good of the state. We will readily concur in whatever shall be there agreed between you, and obey your orders in all things. I refer this, my lord the king, to the decision of my elders, because if I were the first to yield without a struggle, and deserting my peers should make a separate peace, I should doubtless bring shame and dishonour on my whole race. The members ought to follow and not take the lead of the head; good and loyal vassals seek rather to obey their lord than to command him." The king approved Ralph's proposal and discourse, and granted his demand.

Likewise, Geoffrey of Maine,[2] Rotrou de Montfort,[3] and several others, through whose territories he had to pass, did the same, and by their humble entreaties obtained a safeguard from him until his return.

Gilo de Sully,[4] a knight of one of the oldest and noblest families of France, and belonging to the household[5] of Henry, king of France, who had frequently witnessed large assemblies of people, now surveyed the troops in arms all around as he stood on the summit of a lofty hill, and computed them at fifty thousand men, declaring that he had never seen such an army collected on this side the Alps.

The king's first halt in the enemy's country was at Roussei-Fontaine;[6] the next day he encamped at Mont-Bizot,[7] where he passed the night. The third day, he

[1] Ralph de Beaumont, second of that name, viscount of Maine, was eldest brother of Hubert de Beaumont II., lord of Sainte Susanne, mentioned before, vol. ii. p. 378, &c. He was surnamed Paganus, because he was not baptized till a long time after he was born.

[2] Geoffrey II., lord of Mayenne, died the year following.

[3] See before, p. 27.

[4] Gilo de Sulli, lord of La Chapelle and Aix-dans-Gilon, was viscount of Bourges, as successor to Stephen his brother-in-law.

[5] *Familia.* The word, taken in its primitive sense, means that this lord was in his early years one of the attendants of Henry I., king of France.

[6] Roussei-Fontaine, situate about three leagues S.S.E. from Alençon.

[7] Montbizot, four leagues and a quarter from Mans.

reached Coulans, and commanded the tents to be pitched on the meadows of the Sarthe. The cross-bowmen and archers were posted in the vineyards on the sides of the road, with orders to keep a sharp look out against the enemy, and to put them in disorder with showers of missiles if they attempted to pass.[1]

Fulk, surnamed Rechin, count of Anjou, hearing that Elias was a prisoner, immediately went to Mans of which he was the suzerain lord, and being well received by the inhabitants he reinforced the defences with soldiers and slingers. On the king's approach to the city, the knights sallied forth to meet him, and maintained an obstinate engagement with the Normans the whole day, many feats of arms being performed on both sides. For then renowned champions rejoiced in the opportunity of exhibiting their valour, and meriting the praises of their bloody conflicts from their chiefs and comrades.

Paganus de Montdoubleaux,[2] an old friend of the Normans, renewed his alliance with the king, and gave up to him a very strong fortress which he had at Ballon, by means of which the whole place was kept in subjection. The king appointed there Robert de Belèsme commander of the troops and joined with him more than three hundred knights well armed and of approved courage. He treated the inhabitants who resisted with the greatest severity, subjecting them to the most serious losses, employing a great number of his troops in rooting up their vines, and destroying their corn

[1] Coulans, on the left bank of the Sarthe, about three leagues from Mans. It was on his march from Montbizot to Coulans, and between the last commune and St. Pavace, that William Rufus fell in with two rivulets about which Wace tells a story as gross as it is improbable. According to that author, the king of England made a long detour to the east, on the territory of Sargi, to avoid these two insignificant streams, solely on account of the obscenity of their names. To any one who is acquainted with the foul and immoral habits of William Rufus, this scruple, if the account can be believed, will appear one of the strangest facts recorded in history.

A single quotation will suffice to give an idea of the licence and promiscuous intercourse allowed in the court of this monarch. History supplies, among the exemplary reforms introduced by his successor, the following fact: *Lucernarum usum noctibus in curiâ restituit, qui fuerat tempore fratris intermissus.* One historian even adds *prohibitus.*

[2] See before p. 27.

and laying waste the province all around. But he was unable to continue the siege for any length of time, so great was the scarcity of food felt both by men and horses, because it was the season between the old and new crops.[1] A quartern of oats, without which grain it is difficult to maintain the strength of horses in the western provinces, was sold for tenpence of the money of Maine. In consequence the king drew off his troops, ordering them to go and gather the corn into their barns, and when the harvest was over to be ready to besiege the enemy's castles.

William Rufus returning to Normandy with his powerful force, Count Fulk laid siege to Ballon, and attempted for some days to reduce the garrison with the united troops of Anjou and Maine. The garrison, however, reported their danger to the king, and the tidings getting abroad, some gallant knights hastened to the succour of their besieged comrades. Meanwhile, when the count and his troops were at dinner in their tents, and the mendicants from the town returned to the garrison with the alms they had received, informing them that the besiegers were then taking their meal, it being about tierce,[2] several bodies of troops sallied forth in good order, and falling unexpectedly on the enemy while they were eating unarmed, took several prisoners and put all the rest to flight. Walter of Mount Sorel,[3] Goffrey de Briolet,[4] John de Blaison,[5] Berlai de Montreuil[6] and nearly one hundred and forty knights and men-at-arms, with a great number of foot-soldiers were made prisoners, and the conquerors carried off much booty from the enemy, consisting of arms, vestments, and effects of all descriptions. Among the prisoners were several noble lords of castles who, possessed of large domains, held a high rank among the barons of their

[1] Our author means to say that it was the season when the corn of the preceding harvest was consumed, and the growing crops were not yet ripe.

[2] Nine o'clock in the morning.

[3] He was son of William de Montsoreau, the first of that name, and son-in-law of Hersende de Champagne, the first prioress of Fontevrault.

[4] Geoffrey de Briolai, son of Artaud de Briolai and Hersende. His wife's name was Sarmoise de Jarzé.

[5] John de Blaison-sur-Loire, has the title of *proconsul* (viscount) in a title-deed of St. Maur-sur-Loire. His son Theobald was lord of Mirebeau.

[6] Berlai, or Bellai, lord of Montreuil Bellai, son of Gerard, the first of the name. His wife was called the Proud, *Orgoillosa*.

native country, and had under them by hereditary right many very valiant knights.

In the third week of the month of July,[1] King William came to the relief of his garrison, bringing with him a body of troops formidable to the enemy. On the king's arrival the people of Ballon admitted him into the castle with great joy. The prisoners in confinement hearing of it, set up a loud cry, shouting with one voice: "Noble King William, give us our liberty." This coming to the king's ear, he ordered them all to be released from their fetters, and to have a plentiful repast with his own followers in the court of the castle, and that after they had eaten they should be dismissed in freedom on pledging their word. His courtiers objected that in such a great concourse of people the prisoners would easily make their escape, but the king reproved their harshness, and taking the part of the captives said: "Far be it from me to think that a brave knight will forfeit his word! If he did so, he would become a contemptible outlaw all his life."

Count Fulk had fled from the siege to take refuge in the city, where he waited the issue of events in a monastery. The leading men of Anjou now consulted with those of Maine, and finding themselves inferior to the Normans in all respects, procured a conference between the king and the count. The result, by God's help, was the peace which was required, and the people on both sides for various reasons made great rejoicings. It was required and granted that Count Elias and the rest of the prisoners in both armies should be released, and that all the castles which were held by King William should submit to his son William Rufus. The conditions of peace being solemnly confirmed, the king called Robert,[2] son of Hugh de Montfort, the commander of his troops, and directed him to ascend the tower of Mans and the other fortifications, placing under his orders seven hundred chosen men in complete armour with bright helmets and breastplates. They immediately took possession of all the defences of the place, the former garrison marching out, and

[1] Our author probably means the week which commenced on the 18th of July.

[2] Robert de Montfort-sur-Risle, the youngest brother of Hugh, third of that name.

planted the royal standard on the principal towers with great triumph. The next day the king reinforced them with a thousand of his best troops, and commanding the whole city, made whatever ordinances he pleased. The King's Tower, Mount-Barbet, and Little-Mount-Barbet[1] were given up to the king, and justly, because it is known that they were erected by his father. All the citizens rejoicing in the restoration of peace congratulated their new prince, clapping their hands, singing, and making various demonstrations of gladness.

Then Hildebert the bishop, with the clergy and all the people, made a joyful procession to meet the king and conducted him, chanting thanksgivings, to the church of St. Gervase the martyr, where the bodies of the holy bishops and confessors Thuribius and Victor, and other saints, repose.[2]

Elias, released from confinement at Bayeux, came to the king at Rouen, unwashed and unshorn, and humbly said to him: "Illustrious king, who reckon such numbers among your subjects, assist me I pray you in your great goodness. I have long been called count, having possessed a noble county by hereditary right, but by change of fortune I am deprived of my title to the name and possession. Not therefore beseech you to receive me into your household with my former rank, and I will do you worthy service. Not that I demand the city of Mans, or any castles until I shall have merited them of your mightiness by my loyal conduct. I only aspire to be reckoned among your servants and enjoy your royal favour. "The generous king readily determined to grant this, but Robert, earl of Mellent, was moved by jealousy to dissuade him from it. The crafty veteran[3] held the first place in the royal counsels and

[1] *Mons-Barbatus atque Mons-Barbatulus.* There are no remains of these several forts. The King's Tower stood in the neighbourhood and to the W.N.W. of the cathedral, the others in the same quarter, but to the S.W.

[2] St. Julian, first bishop of Mans; St. Thuribius, second bishop of Mans; and St. Victor, fifth bishop of the same diocese.

[3] Our author, who, a little before, has treated Lewis-le-Gros as quite young, when he could not be less than nineteen or twenty years old, is equally careless in calling Robert de Meulan an old man, *senex*, when he was about fifty.

judgments, and he was apprehensive of admitting into the palace one who might prove his equal or superior. He therefore said to the king: "The Manceaux are crafty and faithless, and what they cannot accomplish by their valour they bring about by deceit and manœuvring. Your conquered enemy becomes your suppliant, and seeks perfidiously to be your intimate friend. Why does he desire this? That being admitted to your secret counsels, he may be better able, when a favourable opportunity offers, to revolt fiercely against you, and to join your enemies with greater means of injuring you."

The king's determination was changed by these counsels, and the brave knight was rejected from admission into the royal household. From hence great difficulties, with dangers and losses, were afterwards occasioned to many people. Elias made another attempt to propitiate the king by gentle words but in vain. Whereupon he added with firmness, "If it had pleased you, my lord king, and I had found favour with you, I would have willingly served you. And now, I pray you, do not blame me if I try to do something for myself. I am unable to bear with patience being deprived of my inheritance, and the denial of justice, violence prevailing against my rights. Let no one therefore wonder if I prosecute my claim and use every means in my power to recover my father's possessions." The king replied in great wrath: "Go, and undertake what you please against me."[1]

[1] Although the account of this conversation is shorter and more spirited than those of Ordericus usually are, we prefer that of William of Malmesbury, which appears to express still better the violence of the English king's character.

"Elias being taken and brought before him, the king said jocularly: 'I have you, master.' But he, whose haughty spirit could not brook submissive language even when he was in such urgent peril, replied: 'Ill luck has put me in your power; if I could get away, I know what I would do.' At this, William, almost beside himself with rage, and seizing Elias, 'You!' he exclaimed, 'you! what would you do? Begone—depart—fly! I give you leave to do whatever you can; and by the holy image of Lucca (*per vultum de Lucca*), if you conquer me, I will ask no return for this favour.' The common oath of this prince was "par le saint voult (by the holy face) de Luques,' as his father sware, 'par la resplendor Dé,' by God's brightness, and sometimes 'by our Lord's resurrection.' The oath of

Elias therefore demanded from the king a safe conduct through his territories, and, having obtained it, returned in freedom to his own domains amidst the great joy of his friends. He fortified his five castles,[1] with the adjacent villages, repairing his losses with extreme diligence, and carefully conducting his own affairs. Remaining quiet from August to Easter, in the meantime he carefully considered in what way he should manifest his hostile intentions and had frequent consultations with his faithful allies.

William Rufus, having obtained possession of Mans, as just related, without much effusion of blood, committed its custody to William count of Evreux, Gilbert de Laigle,[2] and other brave knights, and the royal castle,[3] well stored with arms and provisions, and all necessaries, to Walter of Rouen, son of Ansger. Ralph the viscount, Geoffrey of Maine,[4] Robert of Burgundy,[5] and the other barons of the province, came to terms with the king, and giving up their castles faithfully submitted to his orders.

Ch. VIII. *Exactions of the king's officers in England —Archbishop Anselm becomes an exile—Joins Pope Urban II. at Capua.*

While these events were occurring in Normandy, beyond sea, and enormous sums were prodigally spent in useless

Robert Curthose was *per mirabilia Dei*, by God's marvels; and of Henry I. —'par la mort de notre Seigneur.'"

William Rufus was not the first who 'swore "par le saint voult de Luques; it was also the formula of Count Godwin's oath.

[1] The five strongholds on his patrimonial domains and those of his wife, la Flèche, Château du Loir, Maiet, Lucé-le-Grand, Outillé.

[2] These barons had commanded the troops of Normandy on former occasions; see vol. ii., pp. 455, 459.

[3] Probably the castle built by William the Conqueror, which stood, as before stated, on the W.N.W. of the cathedral, whilst the original castle of the counts of Maine appears to have stood within the circuit of the Roman city to the S.S.W. of the cathedral.

[4] For these two persons, see before p. 230.

[5] It is difficult to believe that Robert the Burgundian contracted this alliance, or rather made this submission to William Rufus, for, besides his advanced age, he had joined the crusade, by the persuasion of Urban II. who passed through Sablé in the year 1096, on purpose to induce him. The person here meant is probably Robert, lord of Sablé, third son of Robert the Burgundian.

armaments, Ranulph Flambard ,now made bishop of Durham, and the other minions and officers of the king, were robbing England, and, worse than thieves, pillaged without mercy the granaries of the farmers and the stores of the merchants, not even restraining their bloody hands from plundering the church. On the death of the prelates, they immediately intruded themselves into their places by a violent exercise of the royal authority, and seized without decency whatever they found in their treasuries. They took into the king's hands the domains of the monasteries and the revenues of the bishoprics, and exacted from the abbots or bishops who still survived enormous sums of money. Thus amassing, by fair means or foul, an immense amount of contributions, they remitted it to the king beyond sea, to be employed on his own occasions whether good or bad. Vast sums accumulated by these taxes, were presented to the king who used them ostentatiously to enrich foreigners. But the native inhabitants, unjustly spoiled of their goods, were in great distress and cried lamentably to God, who delivered Israel from the hand of Moab, when Eglon the corpulent king was slain by Aoth, the left-handed.[1]

Anselm, the holy archbishop was greatly troubled at these exactions, and used all the means in his power to succour the oppressed. He endeavoured to stand firmly as a wall of defence for the house of Israel against the worshippers of Baal. He therefore sent trusty messengers to the king with letters, humbly complaining and informing him of the many afflictions to which the church was exposed. But the foolish king hardened his heart and refused to listen to his suppliant teacher, and in consequence Anselm asked for permission to retire to Rome. The haughty prince allowed him indeed to go to Rome, but prohibited his passing through Normandy. Alas! how far was he blinded by his profane pride when, standing on the brink of a precipice, he forbade the servant of God, who was flying from his tyranny, to approach his presence! The king never had another opportunity of seeing him, as he himself was soon afterwards cut off by a bloody death. However, the venerable prelate, obeying the com-

[1] Ehud; see Judges iii. 15,—26. The manner in which Ordericus writes this name confirms the observation already made on his incorrect method of quoting the Vulgate.

mands of his prince crossed by way of Boulogne, having with him, as the reverend companion of his journey, Baldwin de Tournai, a monk of Bec, and Eadmer of Canterbury, an Englishman who afterwards wrote the life of this prelate with great care, to the edification of souls. Anselm accomplished a toilsome journey as far as the city of Capua, the metropolis of the rich Campania, where he met Pope Urban, and, being received with great kindness and respect, made known to him the reason of his coming. The pope was at that time very much engaged, having undertaken to restore peace between the people of Capua, and their prince Richard, the son of Jordan, against whom they had rebelled. The young prince, with the aid of his uncle Roger the Elder, count of Sicily, who was much incensed against the citizens of Capua, used his utmost efforts to compel them to surrender. The aged and venerable archbishop was therefore an exile for nearly two years among the people of Italy where he was born, and other nations, and preached the word with eloquence to his foreign auditors to their spiritual profit. If any one desires to have a fuller account of the acts and discourses of this prelate, he will find them in the book of the aforesaid Eadmer at Bec, which Anselm's predecessor Herluin had governed.[1]

CH. IX. *Count Elias renews hostilities in Maine—William Rufus crosses over to Normandy to oppose him—The king meets with a repulse.*

IN the autumn, King William, having, as has been related, subjugated Maine, and settled affairs in Normandy according to his pleasure, took advantage of a favourable south wind to revisit his wealthy kingdom of Albion.

The year following, after Easter,[2] Elias began to renew hostilities, and with the secret connivance of the inhabitants ravaged the frontiers and harassed the royal forces. At last, in the month of June, he advanced with a gallant body

[1] Our author forgets that he has already related these occurrences in nearly the same words. St. Anselm was a native of the city of Aosta in Piedmont, where he was born in 1033. He quitted England the 15th of October, 1097, and did not return till the 23rd of September, 1100. It would have been, therefore, more correct to have represented his exile as having lasted nearly three years.

[2] Easter fell that year on the 10th of April.

of troops to Les Planches Godefroi,[1] crossed the ford of the river Huisne, and challenged the garrison which held the place for the king, to the combat. The brave Normans sallied forth and fought for a long time, but the numbers of the enemy prevailing they were repulsed and driven back into the city. The enemy entered pell-mell with the king's troops, as the throng was so violent that the garrison could not close the gates, but flying through the streets with great difficulty made their escape into the castle and other fortifications. For Elias was greatly beloved by the citizens, and they much preferred his government to that of the Normans. The garrison however, who had the custody of the fortifications for the king, were amply supplied with all necessaries, and therefore prepared to hold out to the last extremity, loyally fighting in the cause of their lord. Meanwhile, Elias was received in the city with the acclamations of the inhabitants, but a sad disaster speedily ensued, to the public loss. For Walter, son of Ansger, the commander in the castle, ordered the smiths he employed there to set to work, and caused the burning cinders to be hurled by his engineers on the roofs of the houses. "At that time the sun was blazing in the lofty Gemini,"[2] and the earth was burnt up with severe drought. The fiery whirlwind caught the roofs[3] of the houses, and the flames burst out with such violence that the whole city was burnt.

Clarembald de Lisors,[4] with Walter and other knights

[1] M. Le Prevost remarks that there is no tradition of the place which bore this name. M. Dubois says that it is near Mans.

[2] In the original, an imperfect hexameter verse:—

"Tunc rutilus Titan sublimes Geminos peragrabat."

The author means to say that it was between the 21st of May and the 24th of June.

[3] The buildings were probably roofed with shingles, as they still are in the district between Mortain and Domfront, notwithstanding there are quarries of slates in the neighbourhood.

[4] It is considered that the place here spoken of is Lisors-sur-Vie in the canton of Livarot. Clarembald was probably son, or at least a kinsman and heir, of William de Luisores whose name appears as witness to a charter in the early years of William the Conqueror, together with Osmond Basset, Robert and Fuscelin his brothers. It was made in favour of the abbey of Montivilliers which already possessed the other moiety of the lands and of the church of Lisors. See *Gall. Christ.* xi. instr. c. 327 and 328.

carefully guarded their castles. Elias and his followers made desperate efforts to storm them and take them with their machines, but could do nothing against impregnable fortifications.

Meanwhile Robert de Belésme increased the defences of Ballon, and dispatched his courier Amalgise[1] to the king in England. The messenger having crossed the sea hastened to Clarendon,[2] but met the king riding in the New-Forest with his attendants, and to his eager inquiries after the news, replied: "Mans has been treacherously taken by surprise; but my lord holds Ballon, and the king's garrisons guard faithfully all the fortresses entrusted to them, but they urgently demand your royal succour against the hostile forces which surround and threaten them."

As soon as the king had heard the message he exclaimed: "Let us cross the sea to support our friends." The same instant, without consulting any one, he wheeled his horse round, and giving him the spur rode full speed to the coast. Finding there by chance an old worn-out vessel, he embarked in it without any royal pomp, like one of the people, and gave orders for immediately putting to sea.[3] He waited neither for a favourable wind, nor attendants, nor anything else becoming his royal dignity, but, a stranger to fear, committed himself to fortune and the waves, and the next morning, under God's guidance, arrived safe at the port of Touques.[4] Several persons, of various degrees, were stand-

[1] From his name, this courier appears to have been a native of Lombardy.

[2] Clarendon, now only a hamlet in the parish of Albury, about three miles from Salisbury, was anciently a royal residence.

[3] William of Malmesbury supplies the king's rebuke of the cowardice or caution of the nobles who remonstrated against what they considered his rashness, as well as his well known answer to the reluctance of the mariners to put to sea.

"He arrived almost unattended at the sea coast. The sky at that time was overcast, the wind contrary, and a tempest swept the surface of the deep. When he determined to embark instantly, the mariners besought him to wait till the storm should abate and the wind be favourable, 'I have never heard,' said William, 'of a king perishing by shipwreck. No! weigh anchor immediately, and you shall see the elements conspire to obey me.'" Chronicle p. 340, *Antiq. Lib.*

[4] Touques, not the commune of that name, but the port which it has been already remarked was situated at the mouth of the river which falls into the

ing about the harbour, as is the custom in summer, and seeing a vessel coming in under sail from England were in eager expectation to hear if she brought any news. Their first inquiry regarded the king, and he was there to give a true account of himself. He laughed heartily as he gave replies they little expected to their questions, and his answers, which filled them at first with wonder, soon caused universal joy. He then mounted a mare belonging to a priest, and surrounded by a great concourse of the clergy and country folk, who attended him on foot with loud acclamations, he rode to Bonneville.[1] His presence struck with consternation those who were in arms against him on the frontiers of Normandy. After sending out his orders he quickly raised a powerful army, and proceeded by hasty marches to ravage the hostile province. The enemy's troops commanded by Elias, as soon as it was known that the king had passed the straits, dispersed without loss of time, leaving the city they had occupied in a condition much worse than they found it. Hildebert, the bishop, who went to meet the king in Normandy as a suppliant, was received by him graciously as an old friend, for neither by his counsels nor active interference had he taken any part in the late troubles.[2]

The king full of wrath, having intelligence of the enemy's retreat, pursued him closely, without deigning to pass even a single night at Mans. Passing on, he saw the city in flames, and ordered his tents to be pitched on a wide heath[3]

estuary of the Seine, and is in the commune of Trouville. It was probably the curé of that parish who supplied the palfrey which the king mounted to proceed to Bonneville. If it had been from the village of Touques, the distance was so short that he would probably have walked.

[1] Bonneville-sur-Touques, a favourite residence of the dukes of Normandy, where it appears that the expedition for the conquest of England was determined on in 1066. It is about a quarter of a league from Touques, but as much as a league from Tourville.

[2] There is some difficulty in crediting this account of the conduct of the bishop of Mans to a prince who had tried to annul his election, and had always retained the same feeling of ill will towards him.

[3] *Epitimio* or *Epitymo*. This word has before occurred with reference to the field on which the battle of Hastingsw as fought, and though it is somewhat obscure, it was suggested that it may have been derived from the odoriferous plants with which heaths are overspread. It seems to have been applied by our author to any level spot suited for a field of battle or the site of a camp.

on the bank of the river Huisne. On the morrow, he took severe revenge for his wrongs with fire and sword. But before the king could reach the enemy's strongholds and give them to the flames, they set them on fire with their own hands, and laid waste all the country round, lest the freebooters of the royal party should find any thing to pillage, or even a house where they might make their beds and take repose. Thus the castles of Vaux and Oustilli[1] were burnt, and many other villages and hamlets entirely ruined. However Robert de Montfort, the commander of the royal army, pushing forward at the head of five hundred cavalry, extinguished the fire at the castle of Vaux, and strengthened the fortifications for the king's service.

Elias remained at Château-du-Loir with a considerable number of troops, and reserving himself for better times, waited the course of events. At last, on Friday, the king sat down before Maiet,[2] and ordered his troops to storm the castle on the following day. But when Saturday came, and the soldiers were busy in putting on their armour, and preparing to make a vigorous assault on the garrison, the king, by the advice of his counsellors and for the glory of God, spared the enemy out of respect to the day of our Lord's burial and resurrection, granting them a truce until Monday. The besieged took advantage of the interval to strengthen their defences, and to weaken the force of the bolts and stones hurled against them with a quantity of wicker baskets. They were resolute men, faithful to their lord, and determined to fight for him to the last extremity, so that their merit deserves commendation. The assailants had by excessive toil filled up the ditch surrounding the fortifications with great heaps of wood, and were openly engaged in making a road to the foot of the palisades supported by immense beams, when the garrison threw down vessels full of burning coals, and set fire to the heaps of combustible matter which had been collected for their injury, and, assisted by the summer heat, speedily reduced them to ashes. Both

[1] Oustillé or Outillé, a hamlet which has given its name to the commune of St. Mars-d'Outillé, four leagues S.S.E. of Mans. The castle of Vaux, in the commune of Moncé-en-Belin, three leagues and a half south of Mans.

[2] The castle of Maiet, which is seven leagues south of Mans, and rather less distant from la Flèche, and is now the chief place of a commune.

sides suffered very much in this assault, which took place on Monday, so that the king who was witness of it was much distressed. While he was tormented with rage and vexation because all his efforts to reduce the place proved fruitless, one of the garrison hurled a stone at him from the top of a turret,[1] which by God's mercy did not strike the king, but crushed the head of a soldier who was standing near him, so that his brains were mingled with his fractured skull. As he thus miserably perished in the king's presence, the sounds of scornful laughter were heard from the garrison, who raised the loud and horrible cry: "There is fresh meat for the king; take it to the kitchen to be cooked for his supper." The king was so much disturbed that he called his principal nobles aside, and by their advice gave orders for drawing off toward Lucei,[2] at break of day. These prudent counsellors justly thought that, in so well-fortified a place, a brave garrison could make a determined resistance, and, defended by strong walls, had many opportunities of defending themselves against assailants who had no sort of cover. The wary advisers plainly gave good counsel, believing it to be best for troops thus exposed in the present case, that the king should retreat in safety with his forces in good order, and find other means of punishing his enemies; thus securing the safety of his army, and contriving the ruin of his enemy. They were therefore on the move very early in the morning, and employed themselves in laying waste the enemy's country in every way, rooting up the vines, felling the fruit-trees, levelling walls and buildings, and ravaging the whole district, which was very rich, with fire and sword. Then the king returned in triumph[3] to Mans, and gave leave to the troops of many provinces to return home.

These events happened in the year of our Lord 1099, the

[1] *Zeta*, from ζειν, to warm, in its primitive signification was applied to chambers warmed by stoves. We find it, however, used for the *Zetæ æstivales*, as well as *Zetæ hyemales*, in descriptions of palaces. But here, and a few pages before, it is meant to describe vaulted chambers in fortifications from whence the sentinels could observe the motions of the enemy, or hurl projectiles on assailants through the crenelles and machicolations of the defences.

[2] Lucé-le-Grand, rather than Luché, according to M. Pesche.

[3] An expression not very applicable to the repulse the king had received before the castle of Maiet.

seventh indiction, and in the month of July. At this time Jerusalem was captured by the holy pilgrims, they having defeated the Gentiles, who had long possessed it, on the seventh of the ides [the 7th] of the same month of July, as I have related in the last book. Pope Urban also died on the fifth of the calends of August [the 28th of July], having lived to hear with triumph that the tomb of Christ was surrendered to the crusaders. He was succeeded by Pope Paschal, enthroned the sixteenth day after his predecessor's death.[1]

CH. X. *The monks of St. Evroult dispute the bishop's jurisdiction—Abbot Robert's consecration—Dedication of the abbey church.*

GILBERT, bishop of Lisieux, had been often requested by the monks of St. Evroult to give his benediction to their abbot, but he always refused unless the abbot signed a profession of canonical obedience.[2] In consequence, there was a controversy between them which lasted ten years, neither the one nor the other being willing to yield, as each hoped to succeed. Serlo, who was elected abbot on the death of Mainier, governed the monks for two years without being consecrated, because he refused to submit to a profession which was a new custom in the abbey of St. Evroult. In the same way, Roger du Sap presided over the brethren more than seven years, but the bishop obstinately persisting in his views, Roger did not carry the pastoral staff. In consequence, the monks resorted to the royal authority, which secured their rights, an order being given to the contumacious bishop that he should observe the customs used by his predecessors in Normandy in the time of the king's father, William the Conqueror, and consecrate the abbot without requiring any innovation. The bishop reluctantly obeyed the royal command, and the ancient usage of the abbey was confirmed. Ralph, abbot of Séez, conducted to Lisieux the brother elect, and dictated the act of election, as the repre-

[1] Urban II. died on the 29th not the 28th, of July. Paschal II. was elected the 13th of August, and consecrated the next day.

[2] We have here an instance of the obstinate repugnance of the monks to submit to the jurisdiction of the ordinary, that is, of the bishop of the diocese. Their pretensions were encouraged by the secular princes and maintained by the popes.

sentative of the convent of monks. Robert, a monk of Séez, an able penman, engrossed the charter, and Herluin, the bishop's chaplain, read it before all the clergy, who made no objection, to the following effect:—

"Christ, the ever-present bishop and shepherd of the ecclesiastical flock and its pastors, has perpetuated it by a continual succession of souls, and has also continued the pastoral order in perpetuity, appointing a number of priests in succession, inasmuch as death interrupts their permanence. We have no doubt that their consecration ought to be performed by the hands of the bishops giving spiritual benediction from God himself, and we hold it no less certain that their election is the business of their future subjects directed by the Holy Spirit. Wherefore we, the convent of monks of St. Evroult, following the ancient examples and apostolical traditions, after the decease of our father Mainier, and the elevation of our father, the lord Serlo, to the episcopacy, and by the inspiration of the divine mercy, have unanimously elected abbot the lord Roger, our brother, who is well known to us with whom he dwelt, as well as united to us by the same profession. In this election we have been assisted by the presence and opinions of several eminent prelates, viz., the said Bishop Serlo, Anselm, abbot of Bec, Ralph, abbot of Séez, Arnulph, abbot of Troarne, and others, with whom considering, as far as is in our power, after the apostle's rule, the worth of the person, we adopt one who is catholic, instructed in the divine law, chaste, sober, humble, gentle, merciful, benevolent, and endowed with the other qualities which pastors require. Wherefore, offering this our abbot elect, to the blessing of the divine Majesty, we present him to Gilbert, our bishop of Lisieux, demanding for him episcopal consecration according to the ecclesiastical laws, with the canonical benediction."

This act of the monks' election having been carefully read, was graciously accepted by the bishop and clergy, and Roger was consecrated abbot on the feast of the beheading of St. John the Baptist.[1] The next day he was received by the brethren at St. Evroult with due honours. The same day, while the monks were sitting in the cloister conversing with each other, and ably exchanging their thoughts on a

[1] The 29th of August, 1099.

variety of subjects, the conversation happened to turn, as I think, by God's inspiration, on the dedication of the abbey-church; and as it continued, they felt a fervent desire to have it accomplished.[1] At length, to the satisfaction of

[1] Richly stored as we find our author's work in materials from which we may form an acquaintance with the interior life and exterior relations of the monasteries of England and Normandy, it must be confessed that, except in furnishing the dates at which many of them were erected, he throws but little light on their architectural character, although a new style inseparably connected with Norman history had sprung up in the times of his cotemporaries or immediate predecessors. This is much to be regretted, and it is very singular that an author who has devoted a considerable portion of his work to the history of his own convent, and has entered into such minute details connected with it, should have supplied us with such scanty notices of his own abbey church, and other conventual buildings. He appears to have been so careless on a subject which is interesting to posterity, for whose benefit he is continually telling us he wrote, that he even contradicts himself in what he has related.

We find that when the abbey was restored in the year 1050, after having been long deserted, the old chapel built by St. Evroult between the years 575 and 584, was soon found too small for the increasing numbers of the monks, as well as dilapidated by age; and that, consequently, Theodoric, the first abbot on the new foundation, began to build a new church in a noble style of architecture, but was compelled to desist from his undertaking by the troublesome times which succeeded. Very little progress had, probably, been made in the works, as his successor, Abbot Osberne (1061—1066) is represented to have "planned and commenced the new church," making one of the monks, Richard de Heudicourt, a man of rank, who had seen much of the world, overseer of the works, with the charge of the expenditure and the superintendence of the stone-cutters.

We hear nothing of the progress of the works during the five years of Osberne's government; but, upon the appointment of his successor, Abbot Mainier, in 1066, we are told that he "began" building the new church dedicated to St. Mary, St. Peter, and St. Evroult, and which was to contain seven altars, the old church erected by the saint being, as it has been said before, small and dilapidated; and that, by God's help and the contributions and munificence of the brethren and his friends, he completed the building of a spacious and beautiful church, a dormitory, and cellar, and other offices for the use of the monks, vol. i., pp. 467, 468. A shorter account afterwards given concurs in stating that Abbot Mainier "began and completed" the new church and monastery.

Without stopping to reconcile these conflicting statements by inquiring whether the abbey-church, finished by Mainier, was the same as that commenced by his predecessors Theodoric and Osberne, as it probably was, we may conclude that the building thus completed was that which received consecration at the time and in the manner described in this paragraph of our author's narrative, and in the year 1099. The works probably occupied the greater part of the period of Mainier's abbacy, as we find Archbishop Lanfranc contributing to the erection of the abbey-tower and

their friends and with their assistance, the resolution was made, and by God's help, the church of St. Evroult was consecrated on the ides [the 13th] of November. Three bishops assisted in the celebration of this office. Gilbert, bishop of Lisieux, consecrated the high altar in honour of St. Mary, mother of God, St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and St. Evroult, the confessor. Gilbert, bishop of Evreux, consecrated the altar on the south side in honour of All the Apostles, and Serlo the altar of All the Martyrs. The next day Serlo blessed the crucifix and its altar dedicated to St. Saviour and St. Giles, the confessor; and Gilbert of Evreux consecrated the altar used for the matins mass to All Saints. Lastly, on the seventeenth of the calends of December[1]

dormitory in 1078 and at a subsequent time, and Queen Matilda providing for the erection of the refectory on her visit to the abbey some time after the year 1081. However, Abbot Mainier did not live to see the consecration of his noble edifice, and the long delay of its dedication in the time of his successors may have arisen from their disputes with the bishop of the diocese referred to in the present chapter.

We may conclude from the dates supplied, and a few words dropped by Ordericus, that the abbey-church was in the best style of Norman architecture. Of its details and particular character, we have no immediate means of furnishing any account, but we have reason to think that, as in the case of many other abbatial and cathedral churches, the Norman building, or great part of it, was superseded in after times by a new erection in the pointed style. The abbey of St. Evroult shared the fate of other monastic establishments in France at the time of the revolution, but it has only very recently reached the last stage of ruin, being now (1853) nearly levelled to the ground, and the squared and beautifully-worked stones piled in heaps for sale as building materials, so that, shortly, there will not be left a trace of this once magnificent abbey. The only remains now standing which can be supposed to belong to our author's age, are some low Norman arches, in or near the south transept, which appear to have belonged to a mortuary chapel.

The natural features of the neighbourhood, so often described by Ordericus with more precision than the conventual buildings, have experienced of course less change. The little marshy valley is watered by the Charenton, pouring its torrent through meadows in which the remains of the monk's fishponds are still visible. Its right bank rises rapidly to the verge of the wood, where the church of Notre Dame-du-Bois stands on the same spot as the original building founded by the munificence of Childebert's queen. The forest surrounds the whole, as it did when St. Evroult first built his cell in the wilderness. The country people say it is forty miles in circumference; we have traversed it ourselves in nearly a straight line for ten miles in more than one direction.

[2] We have ventured to correct the text by substituting the calends of December for those of November, notwithstanding all the printed editions

[November 15th], the lord bishop of Evreux consecrated an altar on the south, in honour of All Confessors; and, when he had finished celebrating the mass, proceeded to the chapter-house where he strengthened the brethren for God's service by holy exhortations and affectionate prayers and benedictions. At the close of the same year, Serlo, bishop of Séez, dedicated the altar in the north transept on the second of the calends of January [December 31st], in honour of All the Virgins.

Thus, seven altars were reverently dedicated by the three bishops on certain fixed days, and distributed to the praise of God, according to ecclesiastical rule among the glorious orders of saints, who in the heavenly kingdom for ever surround the holy of holies in endless bliss.

Many of the Norman lords were present at this dedication, and the faithful of both orders presented to God the offerings of their prayers. William, abbot of Bec, and Ralph of Séez, Arnulph of Troarne, and Geoffrey of Coutances,[1] Richard d'Ansgerville, and William de Glanville,[2] Etard and William of Evreux, Hugh, son of Saffred, and William d'Eraines, archdeacons and deans,[3] and other dignitaries of the church were present, and assisted their bishops in the solemn performance of the holy services.

Then William de Breteuil gave the same church ten pounds yearly from the rents of Gloz.[4] Robert de Grantmesnil also gave to God the church of St. Samson on

of our author's work have the latter reading. For the 17th of the calends of November would give the date of the 16th of October, long before the ceremonies of consecration commenced, whereas, beginning with the dedication of the high altar on the 13th of November, by the bishop of Lisieux, it appears they were resumed the next day (the 14th) by the bishop of Evreux, and "lastly," on the third day (the 15th) or the 17th of the calends of December, as we conclude, the bishop of Séez consecrated the altar of All Saints.

[1] Geoffrey, abbot of Lessai, whose predecessor died as long before as June 24, 1094, if the archives of Bec may be trusted.

[2] These two persons are mentioned before, vol. ii. p. 122. Richard d'Ansgerville was an archdeacon of Lisieux, and William de Glanville (near Pont l'Evêque), dean of the same church, of which Etard and William were also archdeacons.

[3] Hugh, the son of Saffré and William d'Eraines, in the neighbourhood of Falaise, were archdeacons of Séez.

[4] For this donation see before vol. ii., p. 191.

Mount Calvet the Greater,[1] with one plough land, and the tenth of the fair held in the same village, and the tithes of the mill and wood. Gilbert de Laigle also gave to St. Evroult one moiety of the village of Laigle, in such manner that Richard the knight should hold it of the monks as he now held it of the said Gilbert; for they were already lords of the other moiety by gift from Richard his father. Ralph de Conches also granted to St. Evroult Caldecot and Alvinton[2] in England, and three acres of vineyard at Toëni, and all that he possessed at Guarlenville, and six cottiers on three of his domains, and he also freely ratified all that his tenants had given.[3]

CH. XI. *The author returns to the history of the crusaders —Stephen, count of Blois—Bohemond and Tancred—Raymond, count of Tholouse—Robert, duke of Normandy.*

AT that time there was much disturbance in the west, and shame and confusion were attached to the base deserters of the crusade, in the sight of all men. Pope Urban had sanctioned by his universal authority, and enforced apostolical order by an inviolable decree through all the Latin states, that those who had assumed our Saviour's cross and changing their purpose, had not joined the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, should undertake a corresponding journey in the name of the Lord, or lying under excommunication should for their punishment be cut off from the church. In consequence, Stephen, count de Blois, who had undergone severe sufferings of various kinds, was in great distress of mind, and made preparations for a second expedition.[4] Many thousands were actuated by the same

[1] Montchauvet, four leagues N.E. of Vire.

[2] Caldecot in Norfolk, and Alvington in Worcestershire.

[3] This donation is recorded before, vol. ii., p. 109, but there are some considerable variations in the details. In the first version there are only two acres of vineyard instead of three, and only three cottiers instead of six. This may be accounted for if we suppose that Ralph de Toëni, whose original grant was made in the reign of William the Conqueror, augmented and confirmed it at the dedication of the church of St. Evroult as was also done in the case of William de Breteuil.

The three domains mentioned here are Conches, Toëni, and Acquigni.

[4] Stephen quitted the ranks of the crusaders at the time they were preparing their final attempt to take Antioch. See before, p. 122. He did not return to the Holy Land till 1001, and died the year following under the walls of Ramla.

desire, having heard favourable reports of the noble champions of the cross, who, armed with faith in the Holy Trinity, had fought against the Gentiles, and having obtained a glorious triumph by the power of their merciful Saviour, had secured to themselves endless fame.

I propose now, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, to return to the pilgrims, and relate shortly the adventures and end of those who after their successes remained in Judæa or Syria, as well as of those who effected their return home by an arduous journey.

In the year of our Lord 1099, in the month of August,[1] Godfrey, son of Eustace, count of Boulogne and son of Ita, received the sceptre of David at Jerusalem, and reigned there three years. In the course of the same month,[2] while yet supported by the whole force of his fellow crusaders, he fought a battle with the emir near Ascalon, in which by God's help he gained a glorious victory. In the autumn when the Gentiles were utterly crushed, the God of Sabaoth having fought against them, the illustrious chiefs with their followers resolved to return, and bidding farewell to their friends and comrades, commenced their homeward journey. Among these were Robert, duke of Normandy, Robert, marquis of Flanders, and Raymond, count of Thoulouse,[3] of whose valour the Turks had received sufficient proofs. They met on their road crowds of pilgrims who had been prevented from accompanying them in the first expedition, but who had taken the earliest opportunity they could find of fulfilling their vow of making a pilgrimage to the tomb of our Lord. They suffered severely on the road from famine, being reduced to the last extremity by want, for their precursors, who had in the preceding year wasted the country between Antioch and Jerusalem, sowed the seeds of destruction in their path by the scarcity they occasioned to the pilgrims who followed them; having either slain or driven away the inhabitants of the country, so that the lands, not being cultivated, produced nothing that

[1] It was not in the month, but during the calends, of August, the 24th of July, 1099.

[2] On Sunday, the 14th of August.

[3] Raymond quitted Jerusalem, but it was not to return to the west of Europe, as we shall presently find.

could be eaten. However, the chiefs who were returning home learnt from the pilgrims they met, that Duke Bohemond was besieging Laodicea,[1] and that the troops of the emperor who formed the garrison were making an obstinate defence.

Nearly twenty thousand pilgrims, who were on their road from England and the other islands of the ocean to the tomb of our Lord, had disembarked there at the time when the Gentiles were besieging Antioch and blockaded the Christians in the city. The people of Laodicea received the island crusaders with great satisfaction, and put themselves under their protection against the Turks. The most distinguished of them was Edgar Atheling, who had been unsuccessfully raised to the throne of England after the death of King Harold. He undertook the defence of Loadicea, maintaining its fidelity to Duke Robert, to whom he ceded it after his victory over the Pagans. Edgar was handsome in person. a good speaker, liberal and high-born, being the son of Edward, king of Hungary, but he was slow in action. As for the duke, who was of his own age, he loved him as a brother who had been nursed with him.

In this manner, Duke Robert obtained possession of Laodicea, a city of Syria, and halted there some time with the Normans, English, and Bretons. He stationed a garrison of his own followers in the fortifications of the place, while he continued his pilgrimage to the tomb of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Meanwhile, Ravendinos, the protospathaire of the emperor Alexius, and some of his other officers, arrived by sea and laid siege to the city with a powerful army.[2] The towns-

[1] The siege of Laodicea by Bohemond is wholly apocryphal.

[2] When Jerusalem was taken, the count of Tholouse was the first who held Laodicea, as a vassal of the emperor Alexius. After the battle of Ascalon, the inhabitants of that place consented to receive him as their lord in consequence of their having formed a favourable opinion of his character, from their commercial relations with Montpellier. Raymond, who was the only one of the crusaders who had vowed never to return to his own country, had a great desire to find some settled establishment in the East, after his pretensions had been rejected at Antioch and Jerusalem. Godfrey, refusing his concurrence, the inhabitants of Ascalon declined to receive Raymond, and he withdrew in disgust from the army and with

men, taking the part of their countrymen, expelled the Cisalpines, and thus the imperial commander was introduced by the Greeks and Syrians. Bohemond learning this, lost no time in hastening to the spot with his troops, and besieged the city a long time, making frequent assaults upon it. But when the inhabitants of Laodicea and the Thracians heard that the crusaders were returning from Jerusalem, fearing that if the two armies united they would be invincible, they sent messengers to meet them, carrying presents, and adroitly requesting them to hasten securely to the defence of their city. The crusaders received this invitation with great satisfaction, and continuing their march, were peaceably admitted by the inhabitants within the walls. These occurrences being ascertained, and everything quiet on both sides, Duke Robert and his confederates intimated to Bohemond that he should retire peaceably, or else make instant preparation for battle. On receiving this message, Bohemond assembled his council, and demanded what he was to do in these difficult circumstances. All his friends persuaded him to depart without a struggle, and, content with his own states, not invade those of others to which he had no claim, in hostility to his brothers and brave companions in arms, lest he should become a scandal to Christians and a laughing-stock to Pagans, and stain, by the effusion of Christian blood, the glory acquired by his valour. The duke, with his usual moderation, clearly perceived the soundness of this reasoning, and comprehending the wisdom of the prudent counsels he received, and, acquiescing in them,

only his own followers took possession of Laodicea, of which place he received the investiture from the Greek emperor. After his departure to Constantinople, Tancred, who governed the principality of Antioch, got possession of Laodicea, by force or favour, as the historians state.

As to the occupation of that city by Edgar Atheling on behalf of Robert of Normandy, it took place after the siege of Antioch as our author states, but it was merely temporary, and it might be anticipated from the well-known character of the two princes that it could not be permanent. What became of it in the interval between the two occupations, we do not learn, but it is not probable that Bohemond conquered it from the Greeks, to demand the investiture of it from their own emperor.

M. Le Prevost remarks that the whole of this episode respecting Laodicea will not bear a serious examination. It must have been gathered from the romantic stories of some ill-informed pilgrims, and does not merit the honour given it of finding a place of our author's history.

drew off his forces, though with great regret, out of respect for his companions.

The Greeks and Syrians, thus freed from alarm, consulted respecting their own affairs, and a few days afterwards, having summoned our countrymen to a conference, thus addressed them:—"Illustrious lords, whose worth and courage are now known throughout the world, listen to what we have now to say to you in good faith. We well know that you abandoned rich territories for the sake of your pilgrimage, and that now, having fulfilled your vows, you are anxious to return to them, but principally for the love you bear to your dear wives and children, and your regard for kindred and friends whom you left for Christ's sake. Hear now, with indulgence, the advice we offer towards the accomplishment of this object, which doubtless, by God's guidance, you will approve as sound and advantageous. Give up to us, for the emperor's use, the cities and towns which you possess in Syria and Romania: we, on our part, will completely equip a fleet for your use and convey you and all who choose to follow you, free of charge, to Constantinople, supplying you plentifully with bread and wine and all other necessaries during the voyage. We know the emperor's wishes in this matter, and we desire to please him by such service; for he is flattered by having the Franks about him, admiring and valuing their determination and spirit of enterprise. Take our advice, and present yourselves to him in full confidence, and you will find that we have given you profitable counsel."

The Franks consulted together, and each gave his opinion on various matters after due consideration. The chiefs with their friends had a separate meeting, and the following is the substance of what passed between them: "We are far away in a strange country, and earnestly desire to return home; but there is a double difficulty in our way. We can neither remain here honourably, as becomes our rank, nor go back to France without great danger. Bohemond, who is possessed of Antioch and the adjacent provinces, has widely extended his rule, and will permit no equal to exist here. We are without vessels to cross the sea, and there is no route by land, except through the dominions of the emperor. Besides, we should find it perilous unless we enjoy his

favour, having everything to fear in journeying among barbarous tribes and through difficult roads. We are suffering many privations, and tormented by the apprehension of a variety of dangers. Worn out with fatigues, our great desire is, as before observed, to return to our own country, which is out of our power, either by land or sea, without the emperor's co-operation. What then shall we do? We cannot linger here, for want stares us in the face, weak and weary exiles as we are. It is better for us to be satisfied with the promises of these Greeks, although we know them to be crafty, and, as they are Christians, to accept thankfully their peaceable offers, which we might have been compelled to implore with earnest prayers."

At length the Franks commended themselves to God, in whose hands all things are, and gave a willing assent to all that the Greeks proposed. The latter rejoiced greatly, and faithfully fulfilled what they promised.

The emperor received the Franks on their arrival with due honours, and having heard the terms of the treaty concluded between the Greeks and themselves, he was highly pleased with it, and ratified it by his imperial authority. He offered high dignities to those who were willing to remain with him, and made magnificent presents to those who returned to the western states. The count of Thoulouse was entertained by him as long as he lived, being admitted among the number of his most favoured guests and trusted counsellors. The emperor had an especial regard for him, and listened to him with great pleasure, because he knew that he had firmly opposed Bohemond at Antioch in consequence of his fidelity to him. Raymond's wife, who was daughter of Ildefonso, king of Gallicia,[1] and had been the companion of his long pilgrimage, gave birth at Constantinople to a son called Ildefonso,[2] who became count of

[1] Elvira, natural daughter of Alphonso VI., king of Leon and Castille, was affianced to the count of Thoulouse as his third wife in 1094.

[2] Alphonso-Jordan, so called because he was baptized in the water of this river, was born in 1103, but not at Constantinople as our author states, but at Mont-Pelerin, near Tripoli. He was conducted to France in 1107, and succeeded his brother Bertrand as count of Thoulouse in 1112. He died in Palestine, about the middle of April, 1118, having been poisoned by Queen Melisent.

Count Raymond, his father, was at the emperor's court at Constantinople

Thoulouse as his father's heir upon the death of his brother Bertrand, and still governs the Goths in Provence. Count Raymond long preserved in his chapel at Byzantium our Lord's spear, which Peter Abraham discovered at Antioch. The emperor honoured with many presents, and enriched with liberal pay the other knights who were willing to reside among the Greeks.

He also presented rich gifts to Robert the Norman and Robert the Fleming, and their fellow soldiers, who were hastening their return, giving them a free passage through his dominions and liberty of the markets. Thus he either retained about his own person or sedulously despatched to the coast of Italy those who left the expedition into the countries of the east, making it his great object to weaken the force which was hostile to him in Syria and to place difficulties in the way of all who hastened to the aid of his enemies.

The active Bohemond hearing what we have just related, viz. that the emperor's officers and all the Franks had crossed the sea with their troops, he quickly assembled a powerful army of Normans, Armenians, Allobroges, and other nations, and laying siege to Laodicea with great vigour, forced it to surrender, and having held it twelve years left it to his successors who still possess it. He was also signally successful in reducing under his dominion, to the glory of God and the support of the Christian cause, Mamistra, Albara,

when the crusaders of 1101 arrived there. At first he refused to be their guide, but he afterwards joined them and accompanied them as far as Tortosa, where he established himself, and thus escaped their fearful disaster. From thence he sat down before Tripoli in Syria, and built the castle of Mont-Pelerin to maintain the siege. He died there the 18th of February, 1105. Tripoli did not surrender to the crusaders till 1109, when it was given up to Bertrand, his eldest son.

Raymond's mother, Almodis, was a woman of such irregular habits that she married successively three husbands while they were all living, the counts of Arles, Thoulouse and Barcelona. Raymond himself was very debauched in his youth, but was induced by the counsels of his friend the bishop of Cahors to devote himself entirely to the deliverance of the Holy Land. They were on their journey in company to Clermont, where they had invited Urban II. to preach the crusade, when the bishop died on the road. Raymond did not abandon his design in consequence of this misfortune, but continuing his route, was the first layman who took the cross.

Raymond had lost one eye, but he was proud of the blemish because he received it in single combat.

Marrah, and other fortified places around Reblath. He treated with great reverence the Greeks, Armenians, and Syrians, who observed the monastic discipline in their convents, according to their own rules, and confirmed to them the possessions with which they had been endowed from old times. Besides which, some monasteries which had been ruined by the cruel Turks, and from which they had expelled the religious inhabitants, were given by this valiant lord to Latin monks or clerks, with a liberal provision of ample possessions, that they might be plentifully supplied with all things necessary for the worship of God, and perform divine service according to the rites of the Latin church.[1]

In the year of our Lord 1100, the before named counts, having been honoured by many gifts from the emperor, as already mentioned, departed with their followers, and were received with great favour in Italy by the Normans, who possessed there great wealth. Roger the elder, count of Sicily, and his nephew Roger, duke of Apulia, with Geoffrey de Conversana,[2] nephew of duke Guiscard, and their other countrymen or kinsmen rejoiced at their safe return, and did all in their power to gratify the champions of Christ worn by their numerous conflicts in his cause. While there, Robert duke of Normandy fell in love with a noble young lady, Sibylla daughter of Geoffrey de Conversana, and marrying her took her with him to Normandy. She was distinguished for her worth, of most agreeable manners, and

[1] This paragraph is as contrary to the fact as all that we have already been told with respect to Laodicea. Bohemond never had possession of that city; remaining master of Antioch after the departure of the crusaders in 1098, he was made prisoner by a Turkish emir in 1100, and did not regain his liberty till 1104. He then entrusted the government of his principality to his cousin Tancred, and returning to the West, died there in the month of February, 1111, just as he was on the point of returning to the Holy Land. Most of the acts, whether military or civil, attributed to him by our author, must, therefore, be assigned to Tancred. All the places mentioned in the present paragraph are referred to in the notes to b. ix.

[2] Roger I., count of Sicily, who died in the month of July, the year following. Roger, eldest son of Robert Guiscard, and consequently Bohemond's elder brother, became duke of Apulia and Calabria on his father's death, 1085—1111. Geoffrey de Conversana, Robert Guiscard's nephew, as it is most probable, by his second wife, Sichelgaire, daughter of Waimare IV., prince of Salerno. Conversana is an episcopal city of the province of Bari, situated in the mountains about five miles from the sea.

much beloved by those who knew her. Three years afterwards she had a son born at Rouen, who was baptized by William archbishop of that city, from whom he received his own name.

While Duke Robert was wandering in foreign countries, he did not forget that he had borrowed of his brother ten thousand silver marks,[1] and had pledged Normandy to him for five years. He therefore procured from his father-in-law who was lord of Brundusium (the place where, as Lucan relates Caius Cæsar blockaded Pompey the Great), and his other friends, large quantities of gold and silver and valuable effects, from which sources he amassed a vast sum of money with the prudent intention of paying his creditor in order that he might have the possession of his duchy peaceably restored.[2]

[1] Modern historians have not thought proper to give any account of the origin of this transaction between Duke Robert and his brother, nor of the motives which induced him to join the crusade. The circumstances, as they are detailed by Rudborne, the annalist of Winchester cathedral, are so curious that they deserve to be mentioned.

According to this writer, Robert Curthose promised his father when he was on his death-bed, to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the good of his soul. His natural indolence and the embarrassments of all kinds in which he was speedily involved, for a time suspended the performance of his promise, but it was brought vividly to his recollection by the preaching of the crusade which summoned all Christendom to hasten to the deliverance of the holy places. He, therefore, took the cross with enthusiasm, but the funds required for so expensive an enterprise were wanting in his case, as well as in those of most of his fellow pilgrims. In order to raise them he had recourse to his brothers in England, appealing to their filial regard for assistance to perform a vow which had for its object the good of their father's soul. William Rufus gave him a harsh refusal, telling him, with bitter irony, to go to his friend the king of France. Henry, who was younger, and of a more kindly disposition, declined at first to lend his brother any assistance, but was at length moved to give him a thousand pounds. Upon this, William, unwilling to yield in generosity to Prince Henry, and calculating on the advantages he might gain both to his ambition and avarice, agreed to lend Robert 10,000 silver marks for five years, on condition that Normandy was made over to him as security for repayment of the money at the time specified. These details which disclose so well the character of the three brothers, appear to be worthy of more notice than they have received from most of our cotemporaries.

[2] We believe Geoffrey was really lord of Brundusium, although at first sight the name seems introduced for the opportunity it afforded of displaying our author's classical learning. It is more to the purpose to remark that the lord of Conversana gave his son-in-law a marriage portion more

CH. XII. *The count of Poitiers, having taken the cross, mortgages his states to William Rufus to raise funds for his expedition—The king's ambitious designs.*

THE memorable achievements performed in the east to the honour of Christ by the princes and other faithful servants of the cross were quickly known by report in the western world, and the sons of the church in that quarter exulted in the signal deliverance of Jerusalem and the downfall of Babylon. William count of Poitiers,[1] having heard of these splended triumphs, was inflamed with the desire of undertaking the pilgrimage. An army of three hundred thousand men from Aquitaine, Gascony, and other provinces of the south enlisted under his banner. He determined on mortgaging to William Rufus, king of England, the duchy of Aquitaine and all his territories, on condition of receiving a large sum of money from his treasury to enable him to accomplish the journey he proposed with great splendour. Ambasadors of proved ability were therefore despatched to the king who conveyed to him their master's wishes. The proud monarch, who the more he had the more he coveted, like the thirst of a dropsical man, received the envoy's proposals with great satisfaction, and longed to add the duke's ample possessions to the ancient dominions belonging to his father's duchy and kingdom. He therefore gave orders for the equipment of a powerful fleet, and for a large body of English cavalry to accompany him, that having crossed the sea he might be ready in arms, lion-like, to seize on his prey, oppose by force his brother's return to Normandy, purchase the duchy of Aquitaine, at a vast expense, and reducing to submission all who opposed him, extend the frontiers of his dominions to the bank of the Garonne. Such were the designs of the proud youth, and to such objects his ambition

than sufficient to redeem the duchy of Normandy if he had not spent it on the disreputable favourites who were always about him.

[1] William VII., surnamed the Elder, count of Poitiers, who has been already mentioned by our author as taking part in the expedition of William Rufus against Montfort l'Amauri and Épernon in 1098. He assumed the cross in 1100, and went to the Holy Land the year following. His arrangements with the king of England had been so precisely concluded, that when William was asked a few days before his death, where he meant to spend the ensuing Christmas, he replied, "At Poitiers."

arrogantly aspired; but the Almighty Creator, who rules the world, disposed otherwise.

CH. XIII. *Richard, the duke of Normandy's natural son, killed while hunting in the New Forest—His origin and character—Remarks on the forest.*

THEN, about the season of Rogations,[1] a lamentable event took place in the New Forest. While the knights of the king's court were engaged in hunting, and shooting does and bucks with bolts from their cross-bows, a certain knight aiming at one of the beasts of chase with an arrow chanced to strike an illustrious young prince, Richard, duke Robert's son. He fell instantly dead, to the great sorrow of his numerous friends. The knight, terrified at his great misfortune, fled with all speed to the priory of St. Pancras,[2] and there became a monk, avoiding by that means the two-fold penalties he had incurred. For, retiring from the world, he expiated by penance the guilt of homicide; and escaped at the same time the bitter revenge of the friends and relations of the young prince. Many persons had predicted extraordinary good fortune to the knight referred to, but men, when the God of Sabaoth orders otherwise, are frequently deceived and deceive others; for, clouded by the darkness of ignorance, the thoughts of man are vain.

Let me say something of this young prince. At the time that Duke Robert was foolishly engaged in rebellion against his father, and harassed Normandy from the place of his exile by pillage and other aggressions, he fell in love with the handsome concubine of an old priest, who lived somewhere on the frontier of France,[3] and had by her two sons, Richard and William. Having nourished these children for many years with great care, when they came to riper years, she took them to Normandy, and presented them to the duke as his sons, recalling to his memory many well-known tokens of their familiar intimacy in his youthful days. He partly acknowledged the truth of these assertions, but affected to doubt the children being his; the

[1] The first day of Rogations was Monday, May 7.

[2] St. Pancras at Lewes; see vol. ii., p. 472. At a later period the Norman priory of Mortemer-sur-Faulne was a dependence of it.

[3] Probably in the French Vexin.

mother, therefore, publicly carried red-hot iron, and, receiving no injury, clearly proved that she had conceived by the king's son. Both these brothers were worthy and amiable, but they perished in a moment like the flower of grass; one, as we have seen, was cut off by a wound he received in hunting; and the other, after Henry made Robert prisoner at Tinchebrai, went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and after much distinguishing himself, soon fell in the wars.

Learn now, my reader, why the forest in which the young prince was slain received the name of the New Forest. That part of the country was extremely populous from early times, and full of well-inhabited hamlets and farms. A numerous population cultivated Hampshire with unceasing industry, so that the southern part of the district plentifully supplied Winchester with the products of the land. When William the First ascended the throne of Albion, being a great lover of forests, he laid waste more than sixty parishes, compelling the inhabitants to emigrate to other places, and substituted beasts of the chase for human beings, that he might satisfy his ardour for hunting. Two of his sons, Richard and William Rufus, as well as his grandson Richard, of whom we have lately spoken, perished in this forest; and apparitions of various kinds were seen there, to the great alarm of some persons; and in this way the Lord manifested his displeasure that consecrated churches had been ruined to make a shelter for wild beasts.

CH. XIV. *William Rufus killed by a chance shot while hunting in the New Forest — He disregards warning dreams — The king's character and funeral — Account of Walter Tirel, his family and end — Prince Henry seizes the treasures at Winchester.*

IN the month of July, while the king's fleet was being fitted out with every circumstance of royal pomp, and he himself, having collected from all quarters an immense sum of gold, was waiting on the coast the moment of sailing with great obstinate wilfulness, terrible visions respecting him were seen in the monasteries and cathedrals by the clergy of both classes, and becoming the common talk of the vulgar in the market places and churchyards, could not escape the notice of the king.

A certain monk of good repute, and still better life, who belonged to the abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester,[1] related that he had a dream in the visions of the night to this effect: "I saw," he said, "the Lord Jesus seated on a lofty throne, and the glorious host of heaven, with the company of the saints, standing round. But while, in my ecstacy, I was lost in wonder, and my attention deeply fixed on such an extraordinary spectacle, I beheld a virgin resplendent with light cast herself at the feet of the Lord Jesus, and humbly address to him this petition: 'O Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, for which thou didst shed thy precious blood when hanging on the cross, look with an eye of compassion on thy people which now groans under the yoke of William. Thou avenger of wickedness, and most just judge of all men, take vengeance, I beseech thee, on my behalf of this William, and deliver me out of his hands, for, as far as lies in his power, he has polluted and grievously afflicted me.' The Lord replied: 'Be patient and wait awhile, and soon you will be amply revenged of him.' I trembled at hearing this, and doubt not that the divine anger presently threatens the king; for I understood that the cries of the holy virgin, our mother the church, had reached the ears of the Almighty, by reason of the robberies, the foul adulteries, and the heinous crimes of all sorts which the king and his courtiers cease not daily of committing against the divine law.[2]

On being informed of this, the venerable abbot Serlo[3]

[1] The abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester was founded during the reign of King Ethelred in the year 680.

[2] A foreign monk related to Robert Fitzhamon a still more frightful dream, in which he saw William Rufus come into a church with his usual menacing and insolent gestures, looking contemptuously on the standers-by and gnaw the legs and arms of Jesus Christ on the crucifix. The image bore this for a time, but at length struck the king with its foot in such a manner that he fell backwards. Then such volumes of flame burst from his mouth that the smoke darkened the sky. Robert Fitzhamon thought it right to tell this dream to the king, who heard it with shouts of laughter; "He is a monk," he exclaimed, "and dreams for money; give him a hundred pence." Still he hesitated a long time before he decided on hunting, and did not go till after dinner, having taken a more than usual quantity of wine. William of Malmesbury, p. 344, *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.*

[3] Serlo, who was first a canon of Avranches, in the time of Bishop

wrote letters which he despatched in a friendly spirit from Gloucester, informing the king very distinctly of all that the monk had seen in his vision. On the calends [1st] of August, they were celebrating the feast of St. Peter-in-Vinculis, in the same monastery, and immense crowds of people of all ranks were drawn together on that spot. Then Fulchered, a zealous monk of Séez[2] and first abbot of Shrewsbury, an eloquent expositor of the holy scriptures, being chosen as one of the oldest clergy, ascended the pulpit, and addressed a sermon to the congregation on the word of salvation. In the course of it he openly denounced offenders against the divine law, and filled, as it were, with a prophetic spirit, boldly advanced predictions such as this: "England," he said, "is allowed to become a heritage trodden under foot by the profane, because the land is full of iniquity. Its whole body is spotted by the leprosy of a universal iniquity, and infected by the disease of sin from the crown of the head to the sole of the feet. Unbridled pride stalks abroad, swelling, if I may say it, even above the stars of heaven. Dissolute lust pollutes not only vessels of clay, but those of gold, and insatiable avarice devours all it can lay hands on. But lo! a sudden change of affairs is threatened. The libertines shall not always bear rule, the Lord God will come to judgment of the open enemies of his spouse, and strike Moab and Edom with the sword of his signal vengeance, and overthrow the mountains of Gilboa with a fearful convulsion. The anger of the Lord shall no longer spare transgressors, and the wrath of heaven shall rage against the unbelieving children. The bow of divine vengeance is bent on the reprobate, and the swift arrow taken from the quiver is ready to wound. The blow will soon be struck, but the man who is wise enough to correct his sins will avoid the infliction."

This discourse with others of the same tendency, were addressed to the people in the temple of God on Wednesday, and suddenly the scourge began to be exhibited with full

Michael, and afterwards a monk of Mont St. Michael, was elected first abbot of the Norman abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester in 1072, at the instance of King William. He rebuilt the church, which was consecrated in the month of July, 1100, a few days before the monk's dream.

[1] Fulchered, first abbot of Shrewsbury. See vol. ii. p. 202.

effect. The morning[1] of the day following, King William, having dined with his minions, prepared, after the meal was ended, to go forth and hunt in the New Forest. Being in great spirits he was joking with his attendants while his boots were being laced, when an armourer came and presented to him six arrows. The king immediately took them with great satisfaction, praising the work, and unconscious of what was to happen, kept four of them himself and held out the other two to Walter Tirel.[2] "It is but right," he said, "that the sharpest arrows should be given to him who knows best how to inflict mortal wounds with them." This Tirel was a French knight of good extraction, the wealthy lord of the castles of Poix and Pontoise, filling a high place among the nobles, and a gallant soldier; he was therefore admitted to familiar intimacy with the king, and became his constant companion. Meanwhile, while they were idly talking on various subjects, and the king's household attendants were assembled about him, a monk of Gloucester presented himself and delivered to the king a letter from his abbot. Having read it, the king burst out laughing, and said merrily to the knight just mentioned, "Walter, do what I told you." The knight replied, "I will, my lord." Slighting then the warnings of the elders, and forgetting that the heart is lifted up before a fall, he said respecting the letter he had received, "I wonder what has induced my lord Serlo to write to me in this strain, for I really believe he is a worthy abbot and respectable old man. In the simplicity of his heart, he transmits to me, who have enough besides to attend to, the dreams of his snoring monks, and even takes the trouble to commit them to writing, and send them a long distance. Does he think that I follow the example of the English, who will defer their journey or their business on account of the dreams of a parcel of wheezing old women?"

Thus speaking, he hastily rose, and mounting his horse, rode at full speed to the forest. His brother, Count Henry,

[1] Wednesday, August 1, 1100. Malmesbury, whom we have just quoted, tells us that the king did not go out to hunt till after dinner, but that was an early meal in those days.

[2] Walter Tirel, lord of Poix (Somme), and keeper of the castle of Pontoise.

with William de Breteuil[1] and other distinguished persons followed him, and, having penetrated into the woods, the hunters dispersed themselves in various directions according to custom. The king and Walter de Poix posted themselves with a few others in one part of the forest, and stood with their weapons in their hands eagerly watching for the coming of the game, when a stag suddenly running between them, the king quitted his station, and Walter[2] shot an arrow. It grazed the beast's grizzly back, but glancing from it, mortally wounded the king who stood within its range. He immediately fell to the ground, and alas! suddenly expired.[3] The death of one man caused the greatest confusion among numbers, and the wood echoed with fearful shouts occasioned by the death of their prince. Prince Henry lost no time in riding as fast as his horse could carry him to Winchester, where the royal treasure was kept, and imperiously demanded the keys from the keepers, as the lawful heir. William de Breteuil arrived at the same instant with breathless haste, for he anticipated Henry's deep policy and resolved to oppose it. "We ought," he said, "to have a loyal regard for the fealty we have sworn to your brother Robert. He is, undoubtedly, the eldest son of King William, and both I and you, my lord Henry, have

[1] William de Breteuil, son of William Fitz-Osberne.

[2] Walter Tirel, the third of that name. He must have undertaken the pilgrimage to the Holy Land in which he died after he founded the abbey of Selincourt in 1134. He also founded the priory of St. Denys at Poix. He lived in the Vexin in 1091, at which time he appears as witness in a charter of King Philip I., being a donation of the abbey of St. Melon at Pontoise to the archbishop of Rouen. We must not be surprised to find him sometimes at Pontoise and at others in Picardy, as the counts of Amiens were both counts of Pontoise and the French Vexin.

Richard Giffard, his wife's father, was probably brother of Walter Giffard, earl of Buckingham.

Hugh Tirrel, son of Walter III. and Anne, went also to the Holy Land in 1146.

[3] Malmesbury informs us that on receiving the wound the king uttered not a word, but breaking off the shaft of the arrow where it projected from his body, fell upon the wound by which he accelerated his death. The sun was declining, and the king, at the time he was shot, was holding up his hand to screen his eyes from the sun's rays athwart the glades of the forest, while he was keenly gazing at a stag which he had just slightly wounded.

paid him homage.[1] Therefore we ought to keep our engagements to him in all respects, whether he be absent or present. He has long laboured in God's service, and the Lord now restores him, without a contest, the duchy which he relinquished for the love of heaven, as well as his father's crown." There was now a sharp contention between them, and crowds flocked round them from all quarters; but the influence of an heir present in person to claim his rights began to prevail. Henry hastily seizing his sword drew it out of the scabbard, declaring that no foreigner should on frivolous pretences lay hands on his father's sceptre.

At length, through the intervention of friends and prudent counsellors, the quarrel abated on one side and the other, and by a wise resolution, to prevent a serious rupture, the castle, with the royal treasures, was given up to Henry, the king's son. This had been long before predicted by the Britons, and the English desired to have for their lord a prince they regarded as illustrious because he was nobly born on the throne.[2]

On the king's death, many of the nobles hastened at once from the forest to their own abodes, and began to put their affairs in order, in anticipation of the troubles which they feared would follow. Some of the servants wrapped the king's bloody corpse in a mean covering, and brought it, like a wild boar pierced by the hunters, to the city of Winchester. The clergy, the monks and citizens, with the poor widows and mendicants, went in procession without delay to meet the body, from respect to the royal dignity, and buried it in the old minster of St. Peter.[3] Notwithstanding,

[1] Our author, so far from applauding the loyalty of William de Breteuil, already exhibits his great partiality for Henry I. Robert Curthose was odious to the clergy not only on account of his licentious conduct, but because he afforded them no protection against the rapacity of the barons.

[2] He was the only son of William the Conqueror born after his accession to the throne of England, being what the Greeks of the lower empire called *Porphyrogenites*, born in the purple, a circumstance to which the Anglo-Saxons attached great importance, regarding it as a strong confirmation of the right to the throne.

[3] The king was interred within the court of the castle. That part of the building soon afterwards fell to the ground, and it was regarded as a sign of the divine wrath against the king. It was rebuilt from funds left by Bishop Walkelin. The funeral procession was not so mean as our

the doctors and prelates of the church, taking into consideration his debauched life and tragical end, did not hesitate to pass sentence upon him, and thought, that as they had been unable to inflict salutary punishment upon him for his iniquities while he lived, he must be treated as a reprobate,[2] and one who did not merit absolution. In some churches the bells did not ring his knell, although they often are tolled long for paupers and women of the lowest rank. Of the immense treasure he had amassed, wrung from the labours of the wretched people, no alms were given to the poor for the soul of their former avaricious owner. The soldiers who served for hire, the bullies and common whores missed their gains at the death of the debauched king, and lamenting his miserable end, not so much from regard, as from their loss of the supplies which ministered to their detestable vices, sought carefully for Walter Tirel, threatening to tear him in pieces in revenge for the death of their patron. However, the moment the deed was done he hurried to the coast, and crossing the sea took repose in his castles in France, where he laughed in security at the threats and curses of his malevolent enemies. He married Alice, daughter of Richard, of the noble family of Giffard, who bore to her husband Hugh de Poix, a very valiant knight. Many years afterwards Walter went in pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and died penitent on the holy journey.[2]

author infers: *multorum procerum conventu, paucorum planctu.* Many of the nobility attended, though there were few mourners.

[1] *Biothanatum.* The portrait of this king is thus drawn by a contemporary writer: "He was square-built, the colour of his skin red, and his hair of a yellowish tint, his brow was open, his eyes were of different shades, varying with certain glittering specks. His strength was prodigious, though his frame was not large, and his belly was rather protuberant. He had no pretensions to eloquence, but was remarkable for stammering in his speech especially when angry. He had so little inclination or leisure for learning that he never attended to it."—*Malmesbury.*

It appears, therefore, that his surname was given him more from the florid tint of his face than the colour of his hair. He was more than forty years old at the time of his death. One of the principal grievances of the Anglo-Saxon people in his time, as well as his father's, was the destruction of churches and churchyards in extending the forests. Stephen Berchington, *Vitæ Archiepiscop. Cantuar.* attributes to him no less than twenty desecrations of this sort.

[2] It appears that Walter Tirel denied to the last his having been the

CH. XV. *Coronation of Henry I.—His character—Protects the church—Fills the vacant bishoprics and abbeys—Conduct of the nobles—Henry marries the Anglo-Saxon princess Matilda.*

IN the year of our Lord 1100, on Thursday, the fourth of the nones [20th] of August, William Rufus was mortally wounded by an arrow in the New Forest, after having possessed the kingdom of England twelve years and nearly ten months. Thereupon Henry hastened to London with Robert earl of Mellent, and the following Sunday[1] was placed on the throne in the church of St. Peter the apostle, at Westminster, being anointed by the venerable Maurice, bishop of London. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, was then an exile, as it has been already observed, and Thomas, archbishop of York, being lately dead,[2] that metropolitan see was still vacant. Henry was thirty years old when he ascended the throne, and his reign lasted thirty-five years and four months.[3] He ruled the dominions, divinely committed to him, with prudence and success in prosperity and adversity, and was distinguished among the princes of Christendom for his love of peace and justice. In his time the church of God was brilliantly endowed with wealth and honours, and all orders of the religious increased to the glory of the Creator. This is shown by the monks and clergy, who, during his reign, augmented their numbers and their dignity; this is proved in the case of anchorites, who,

person by whose hand William Rufus fell. Suger, a cotemporary historian, and, as it seems, a friend of Tirel, in his life of Louis-le-Gros, king of France, alluding to the death of Rufus, remarks: "One Walter Tirel, a nobleman, was accused of shooting the king with an arrow; but I have often heard him assert on his solemn oath, at a time when he had nothing either to fear or hope, that on that day he was neither in the part of the forest where the king was hunting, nor saw him at all while he was in the wood." This testimony, however, can hardly avail against the concurrent agreement of tradition and history.

[1] Sunday, August 5.

[2] This is incorrect; the archbishop of York survived till the end of the following November. It is not even quite certain that he did not assist at the coronation of Henry I., placing the crown on his head, after the royal unction had been given by the bishop of London. At any rate the archbishop did not die till Sunday, November 28.

[3] In the MS. of St. Evroult the figures have been erased, and the six last words, "reigned five years and six months," interlined.

felling dense woods, and rearing among them the lofty spires of churches and abbeys, exult in their labours, and sing the praises of God with heart-felt peace, where once robbers and outlaws, abandoned to all wickedness, found their retreats.

From the beginning of his reign, Henry had the wisdom to conciliate all parties, attaching them to his person by his royal munificence. He admitted the nobles to a high place in his favour, loaded them with wealth and honours, and secured their fidelity by his flattering caresses. The common people among his subjects he indulged with equitable laws, and protected by his authority from unjust exactions and pillage. This illustrious prince thus distinguished himself above all the lords and kings of the west, and obtained the favour both of the clergy and laity, who were delighted to find themselves governed with reason.

Henry began to console the widowed churches, deprived of their pastors, by giving them learned men, with the advice of his council. He promoted William Giffard,[1] who was the chancellor of the late king, to the see of Winchester, and Gerard, bishop of Hereford, to the archbishopric of York.[2] He also despatched messengers in haste over the sea, recalling to his see the venerable Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, who had been driven out by the indecent persecutions of King William.[3] Henry gave the abbey of Ely to Richard,

[1] This bishop must have been of the family of the Giffards, lords of Longueville and earls of Buckingham. He was chancellor to three kings, William I. in the latter years of his reign; William II. 1093—1100; Henry I. 1100—1108. Not having been willing to receive consecration from the archbishop of York, he left England with St. Anselm, and did not return till that prelate was recalled.

[2] Gerard, nephew of Walkeline, bishop of Winchester, and of Simeon, abbot of Ely, was first a canon and precentor of Rouen, and afterwards attached to the royal chapel. He was made bishop of Hereford in 1096, and archbishop of York on the decease of Thomas his predecessor in the month of November, 1100. Gerard died in 1108. He was only a sub-deacon when he was appointed bishop, and Anselm had to ordain him deacon and priest the same day, and consecrated him bishop the day following.

[3] St. Anselm was at the abbey of Chaise-Dieu in Auvergne when he received the first intelligence of the death of William Rufus. He decided immediately to listen to the request of his clergy and return to England. He had not reached Lyons on the road from Cluni when King Henry's

son of Richard de Bienfaite, a monk of Bec,[1] and the abbey of St. Edmund, king and martyr, to Robert, a young monk of St. Evroult, son of Hugh, earl of Chester.[2] He appointed Herluin, of Caen, abbot of Glastonbury, and Faricius, of Malmesbury, to Abingdon.[3]

Hugh, earl of Chester, and Robert de Belèsme, with other barons, who were at that time in Normandy, on learning

letter met him, and caused him to accelerate his journey. He arrived at Dover, September 23.

[1] Richard, abbot of Ely, was the fourth son of Richard de Bienfaite.

[2] Robert, abbot of St. Edmundsbury, was the third son of Hugh Lufus, earl of Chester.

The king bestowed these two abbeys on the day of his coronation. His good understanding with the abbot of Ely did not last long: at the outset Abbot Richard refused to be consecrated by the bishop of Lincoln in whose diocese his abbey stood, and afterwards he lost the royal favour for three reasons,—for having come to court with too pompous a retinue, for not obeying with sufficient punctuality the royal commands, and for shamefully dismissing a jester belonging to his household for foul words. This last charge is not very intelligible; *conviciantem*, the phrase used having also a good sense, being used by Martial for a merry jest, besides its common acceptation of railing or brawling. However, for these offences Richard was deprived of his abbey. He retired to Rome, where, meeting St. Anselm, he had the courage to espouse the cause of King Henry against that prelate, upon hearing which Henry restored him to the possession of his abbey. He retained it till his death, which happened in 1107, just at the time that he was making arrangements, with the king's consent, for its being erected to a bishopric, which took place soon afterwards.

The election of Robert de Chester was quashed in the council held at London by St. Anselm in the end of September, 1107, on the ground that the monks of St. Edmundsbury had the right to choose their own abbot. They forthwith exercised it, and substituted Robert their prior for Count Hugh's son. In general the English monks had a great aversion to Norman abbots on account of their arrogance, avarice and tyranny.

[3] Glastonbury abbey had been stripped by William the Conqueror of great part of its domains. Abbot Herluin proved a vigilant and economical steward of its property, and recovered part of what had been alienated.

The last two appointments were made soon after King Henry's coronation; for the new abbot of Glastonbury was instituted at the feast of ALL SAINTS, the same year, by the bishop of Lincoln. He had been a monk of Malmesbury, and Henry appears to have placed great confidence in his medical skill, so much so that we are told he frequently trusted for the restoration of his health to the abbot of Malmesbury's prescriptions only. So highly did the king esteem him that he had some intentions, after St. Anselm's death, of raising him to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. Faricius died February 23, 1117. He was a native of Arezzo.

the fate of their unfortunate prince and the sudden change of events, put their affairs in Normandy in order, and hastening over to England offered due submission to the new king, and having done homage to him received confirmation in their possessions and all their dignities, with royal gifts.

King Henry did not listen to the counsels of rash young men, like Rehoboam, but wisely followed the advice of the wise, and the recommendations of experienced persons. He admitted to his councils Robert de Mellent, Hugh of Chester, Richard de Reviers, Roger Bigod,[1] and other able and sagacious men, and receiving with deference their prudent admonitions, ruled with success many states and nations.

This king, four months after he succeeded to the throne, disdaining to abandon himself to illicit connections, and be like horse and mule which have no understanding, married with royal pomp Matilda, a noble lady, by whom he had two children, Matilda and William.[2] She was daughter of

[1] The reader is already sufficiently well acquainted with Robert de Meulan (or Mellent) and Hugh, earl of Chester, as well as with Richard de Reviers, son of Baldwin, the subject of a long note, vol. ii. p. 498.

As for Roger Bigod, or Bigot, he already held vast domains in the county of Norfolk of which we shall presently find his posterity securing the possession by a double perjury. Roger Bigod was probably the son of that Roger Bigod, a kinsman of Richard d'Avranches, who disclosed the ambitious designs of William Werlenc. See William of Jumièges, lvii. c. 22. This Robert Bigod seems to have become speedily an important person. In the charter of donation of St. Philibert-sur-Risle, in 1106, he appears as a witness to a release by Robert de Beaufoy, with Duke William and Roger de Beaumont only.

Our author forgets to mention among the great nobles attached to Henry I., Robert Fitz-Hamon and Henry, earl of Warwick, *vir integer et sanctus*, says William of Malmesbury.

[2] It may suffice to observe that Henry's desire to ally himself with the grand-daughter of Edward the Confessor was neither inspired by his purity of morals, which history flatly contradicts, nor attracted by very ardent passion for that princess, of whose exterior advantages all that William of Malmesbury can say is, that she was not very ugly—*usquequaque despicabilis formæ*, and whose monastic habits and virtues were far from suiting the habits of the Norman princes. It was not without regret that she found herself compelled to quit the cloister and the veil (which she had really taken) to re-enter the world even upon a throne; and she again left it when she had borne two children to her husband, retiring to Westminster, and dividing her time between her devotions, the care of the sick, and the pleasure of listening to church music. That was her predominant

Malcolm, king of Scotland, and his queen Margaret, and descended from the race of King Alfred, son of King Egbert,[1] the first who possessed the sovereignty of the whole of England after the massacres of the Danes and the death of St. Edmund, king and martyr. After the Angles came into Britain from the isle of Angle, in which the metropolis of Saxony is situated, and, under Hengist their principal chief, conquered or exterminated the Britons, now called the Welsh, they named it England, after their native country. Five kings then reigned in it, as we find in the works of Gildas the Briton, and Bede the Englishman.[2]

The wise Henry, reflecting on the illustrious birth of the princess I have named, and having been long attracted by her many graces and virtues, chose her for his partner in Christ, and shared his throne with her, causing her to be crowned by Gerard, bishop of Hereford.[3] Having given

passion, and she spared neither promises nor expense to draw round her proficients in that art.

It seems to have escaped our author that political motives were Henry's chief inducement to form this alliance. Received with coldness by the Norman barons, who preferred his brother Robert, he found that he could do nothing better than to conciliate in this way the English people, who preserved their devotion to the race of their ancient kings, and who saw in Matilda not only the restoration of the blood of Edward the Confessor, but his piety and monastic habits. Thus, long after her death, her memory was cherished under the name of MOLD, THE GOOD-QUENE.

[1] King Alfred was not son, but grandson of Egbert.

[2] It is unnecessary to follow the author in his digression on the *isle of Angle*, and the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy, of which he is pleased to make a Pentarchy. Every one knows that the Angles were only one of the three tribes who invaded and colonized Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries, the others being the Jutes who had Hengist and Horsa for their chiefs, and established themselves in the isle of Thanet in 449; and the Saxons who settled in Sussex and Surrey (491), Westsex (494), and Essex (527). The Angles who came from the S.E. of the duchy of Sleswig, established themselves in the eastern counties, East Anglia (527), the northern, Northumbria, and lastly in Mercia, the central districts between the Thames, the Humber, and the Severn, in 528.

[3] The marriage was celebrated on St. Martin's day, November 11, three months after Henry's coronation. St. Anselm was with difficulty induced to consent to it, because Matilda had actually taken the veil. Fortunately witnesses were found to swear "that she had merely worn it to get rid of her suitors without making her profession." The princess herself only yielded from fear of violence, and by the persuasion of her abbess. It was not the bishop of Hereford, as our author states, but St. Anselm, who gave the nuptial benediction to the royal couple, and crowned the young queen.

these brief details of events in England, I must now add to my work what concerns the affairs of Normandy.

CH. XVI. *Disturbances in Normandy on the death of William Rufus — Duke Robert, returning from the crusade, takes possession of the duchy — Disorders in consequence of his indolence.*

IN the month of August, no sooner was the disastrous fate of the king known in Normandy, than the unbridled rage of the Normans vented itself in tearing open the wounds in the entrails of their own country; for the very same week William, earl of Evreux, and Ralph de Conches made an incursion on the territories of Beaumont with a powerful force, and swept off a vast booty from the lands of Robert, earl of Millent, on the pretext of some injuries he had inflicted on their allies arising out of the perfidious counsels which he had long since given William Rufus against them.[1] In like manner, others who had long harboured anger and malice, which they were unable to vent in open hostilities on account of the rigour of their prince's government, now that the reins of justice were relaxed, flew to arms against each other with the utmost violence, and desolated that unhappy country, while it had no sovereign, with mutual slaughter and ruin.

In the course of September, Duke Robert returned to Normandy, and being received by his subjects, undertook a journey with his consort Sibylla to Mount St. Michael-in-peril-of-the-Sea. There, having offered thanks to God for his safe return from his long pilgrimage, he afterwards knew his wife,[2] who was daughter of Geoffrey, count de Conversana, and the year following she bore him a son, who, being baptized by William the archbishop, received that prelate's name. Robert took possession of his duchy without any

[1] The vast domains of the count of Mellent at Beaumont-le-Roger lay, in fact, contiguous to those of the count of Evreux and the territory of Conches, the lords of which had for several generations maintained hostilities with those of Beaumont, the objects of their constant jealousy. Robert de Beaumont's haughty and rapacious character was little calculated to extinguish these hereditary feuds.

[2] Our author would seem to intimate that Robert Curthose did not consummate his union with the duchess Sibylla until after his pilgrimage to Mount St. Michael, which is not very probable.

opposition, and governed it, in name at least, for nearly eight years.[1] But he desperately[2] abandoned himself to indolence and effeminacy, and thus rendered himself contemptible to his restless and turbulent subjects. Robberies and ravages were carried on in all quarters without restraint, and calamities were multiplied to the ruin of the whole country.

CH. XVII. *Count Elias regains the town of Mans, and besieges the citadel — Singular transactions during the siege — Its surrender — Elias restored to the county of Maine — His subsequent acts and his family.*

ELIAS, son of John de Fleche, having heard the welcome news of the death of King William fully confirmed, put himself in march for Mans at the head of a body of his armed retainers, and, being well received by the citizens who were well affected to him, took possession of the city without opposition; and, calling to his aid Fulk, count of Anjou, his suzerain lord, besieged the citadel for a long time. Haimeric de Moira and Walter of Rouen, son of Ansger,[3] held the town with a sufficient garrison and plentiful stores of provisions and arms, and all that was required for the besieged to make an obstinate resistance. The two parties had daily conferences, and threatened each other; but their menaces were frequently mingled with jokes. Count Elias was allowed the privilege, whenever he wished to confer with those who had the custody of the citadel, of doing so without molestation on his putting on a white tunic. Trusting without hesitation to the good faith of persons of whose honour and loyalty he felt assured, and being distinguished by his white dress, he frequently went among the enemy all alone, and did not hesitate to hold long

[1] Our author in this paragraph is, as usual with him, incorrect in the chronology. Between the month of September, 1100, and the 28th September, 1106, it is impossible to count eight years, even commenced.

[2] *Damnabiliter.*

[3] We have often heard before of this Walter, son of Ansger, as commander of the citadel of Mans. As for Haimer "*de Moria*," his name ought to be written "Moira." There are still existing traces of two fiefs so called, one at St. Vincent-des-Prés, the other at Colombiers. A charter of William Rufus is extant, addressed, "Hamerico de Moira," relating to the church and canons of St. Julien at Mans.

conversations with them. Those within the castle and those without mutually indulged in good-humoured banter on a variety of subjects, jesting with each other without ill-will, so that their discourse became the admiration and delight of the people of that country in future times.

At length Walter and Hameric, after some days, said to Elias, "We guard this strong castle, which our master has committed to our custody, and we fear neither you nor your warlike engines as long as we choose to resist you. It is in our power to annoy you with stones and arrows, having the advantage of you from our high tower; but from the fear of God and our natural regard for you, we do not injure you, especially as we really do not know in whose service we now are, and for whom we hold the place. We think it, therefore, would be right and convenient that a truce should be made on both sides until a messenger returns from our lords, the princes of England and Normandy. On his return we shall do what reason tells us." Elias was delighted at this proposal which he communicated to Fulk, and both readily agreed in accepting the terms offered by the Normans.

Meanwhile, the messenger who was despatched to the duke of Normandy thus addressed him: "Walter and Hameric guard the citadel of Mans, according to King William's orders; they are besieged by the forces of Maine and Anjou, and they demand succour from you, wishing to learn what they shall do to follow your wishes. If you desire to hold the place, come to their relief with a strong body of troops, and release them from the enemy who is besieging them. Otherwise instruct them what they are to do that they may escape destruction."

The duke, exhausted by the fatigues of his long pilgrimage, and liking better to enjoy a quiet bed than to encounter the toils of war, sent word to the besieged by their messenger that they were to make peace on honourable terms with the besieging army. "I am worn out," he said, "with my protracted labours, and am contented with the duchy of Normandy. I am also invited to cross the sea by the barons of England, who are ready to acknowledge me king."

The messenger from the garrison, on receiving this answer, did not return to Mans, but embarking in all haste

went to the court of the king of England, and communicated to him in detail with great clearness what the duke had just said to him, as I have quoted it. Henry, however, was so occupied with the affairs of his transmarine states, that he wisely preferred devoting himself to the care of what was lawfully his own, than to burden himself through ambition with foreign enterprises which had no just claim on his attention. He therefore returned his thanks to the keepers of the citadel for their good will towards him, and honourably dismissed their envoy with royal gifts. The messenger accordingly returned to his employers, and detailed to them the answers he had successively received from King William's sons.

In consequence, Walter and Hameric, having laudably proved their fidelity, caused Elias to put on the white shirt, which was the occasion of his being called "The White Bachelor;"[1] and he lost no time in obeying the summons. The keeper of the citadel, seeing him coming in great haste, called out to him merrily: "White Bachelor, you may well be glad, now that the moment you have long expected is arrived. If you have plenty of money in your treasury, you will be able to make a good bargain with us." Elias asking what sort of a bargain they meant, they replied: "The great William, king of England, built this citadel; his successor entrusted it to our keeping; but now, alas, he is dead. We therefore give it up to you, and acknowledge you as count of Maine. We do so under no compulsion, and under no alarm at your valour; if we wished to make a longer resistance, we have the means of protracting the siege, for our hearts are bold, and arms and provisions are not wanting. But we have no legitimate master, to whose service we may devote our powers, and, therefore, noble sir, well assured of your merit, we choose you; and having surrendered the citadel into your hands, declare you count of Maine from this day."

[1] The text reads *Baculari*s, one who carries a bâton or staff, but *Baccalarius* is evidently the word meant. The name was given to Count Elias not from his being a knight, bachelor, or banneret, but because he was deprived of his honour as count of Maine, and consequently held an inferior position to that which properly belonged to him. He was therefore a pretender, an aspirant to the county, as the bachelors were to the rank of knights-banneret.

The gallant soldiers, having thus addressed Elias, concluded a treaty with him, and delivered to him that strongly fortified citadel, with all the stores collected in it by William Rufus. Peace being restored, the brave garrison marched out with their arms and baggage, and were received by the two counts,[1] not as vanquished foes, but as faithful allies. Count Elias conducted them in safety through the streets at the head of two hundred men-at-arms, for their protection against the citizens, whose houses they had burnt the year before. In this manner Count Elias recovered his county after three years, and he governed it with honour until the time of his death, nearly ten years afterwards.[2]

Meanwhile, in the course of a few years, he contracted his daughter Eremburge in marriage with Fulk, count of Anjou, his suzerain's son,[3] and appointed him his successor as count of Maine. He afterwards made alliances with Duke Robert and King Henry, and took a distinguished part in the wars between them,[4] to the great injury of one of those princes and advantage of the other. On the death of his consort, not liking to submit to a life of celibacy, he married Agnes, daughter of William, duke of Poitiers, and relict of Alphonso the Elder, king of Galicia.[5] The marriage was celebrated with great rejoicings, but the princess unhappily died the year following. Bishop Hildebert interred her remains in the church of St. Peter the apostle, at Couture.

[1] Fulk, count of Anjou, and Elias, count of Maine.

[2] Count Elias died July 11, 1110, and was buried in the abbey church of La Couture. His tomb was to be seen there as late as the year 1790. He was represented upon it in chain armour, with his helmet on his head, and holding a triangular shield on which was emblazoned a cross "ancrée."

[3] This marriage also took place in 1110, according to the chronicle of St. Aubin.

[4] At the battle of Tinchebrai.

[5] This marriage was contracted in 1109. Agnes, daughter of William VIII., count of Poitiers, was not a widow. She had been divorced in 1080, on account of consanguinity, from Alphonso VI., king of Léon, Castille, and Galicia, to whom she was married in 1074.

CH. XVIII. *The Norman barons in England form a league in favour of Robert Curthose—He crosses the channel, and claims the crown—Treaty between him and Henry I.—Flambard committed to the tower—Escapes—His career in Normandy—Death of Gilbert Maminot, bishop of Lisieux—And affairs of that see.*

IN the year of our Lord 1101, great disturbances broke out in England and Normandy. The turbulent barons, dreading the firmness of King Henry, and preferring the inactive government of the imbecile Duke Robert, which gave them licence for their malpractices, began to entertain treasonable designs, and invited him to equip a fleet and cross over to England. Robert de Belèsme and his two brothers, Roger of Poitiers[1] and Arnulph,[2] together with William de Warrenne, earl of Surry,[3] Walter Giffard,[4] Ivo de Grantmesnil,[5] and Robert Fitz-Ilbert,[6] and several others were parties to the league, and aided the duke's cause, at

[1] Roger de Montgomery, sometimes called earl of Lancaster, third son of Mabel and Roger de Montgomery, received the surname of the Poitevin on account of the vast domains he possessed in Poitou in right of his wife Almodis.

[2] Arnulph de Montgomery, castellan, not earl, of Pembroke, as the French writers call him, was the fourth son of Mabel and Roger.

[3] William de Warrenne, earl of Surrey, the second of that name.

[4] Walter Giffard, second of the name, and earl of Buckingham; he died the year following, as we shall presently find.

[5] Ivo de Grantmesnil was one of the *Funambules* at Antioch, see before, pp. 128, 129.

[6] Robert, son of Ilbert de Laci, who held the castle of Pontefract in Yorkshire, and sixty-three other manors, most of them in the same county. This Robert de Laci founded at Pontefract a priory of the order of Cluni, in which he placed monks from the celebrated abbey of La Charité-sur-Loire. In the charter of foundation he mentions his father Ilbert and his mother Havise.—*Mon. Angl.* i. 648.

Ilbert de de Laci and his mother Havise were owners of Bois l'Evêque, near Darnetal. Emma de Laci, when she took the veil at St. Amand of Rouen, some time before the year 1069, gave to that abbey twenty-two acres of land in Boos on Mount Mainart, probably Mount Main, which the abbess sold to a monk of La Trinité-du-Mont.

In 1080 Enguerrard, son of Hilbert (probably Ilbert de Laci), gave to the Trinité-du-Mont two thirds of the tithes of Bois l'Evêque. This Enguerrard was apparently a great person, as his signature precedes that of the count of Morton. There is great reason to believe that he was a son, hitherto unknown, of Ilbert de Laci. For the genealogy of this family in England, see *Monastic. Anglican.*, p. 859.

first in secret, but afterwards openly. The weak duke, instead of guarding his own dominions, imprudently hazarded and lost them, led away by his ambition for a crown which his abler brother firmly wore.

The duke at this time granted to Robert de Belèsme the bishopric of Séez,[1] with the castle of Argentan and the forest of Gouffern; and to Theobald Paganus the castle of Gisors,[2] because on one occasion he had found an asylum with him. He also made large presents from his treasury to other lords, and promised if he became king far more than he could perform. As, also, he did not give up the society of harlots and buffoons, but shamefully encouraged them, he so wasted his means, that, in spite of the wealth of his wide duchy, he was often penniless, and so much in want of clothes that he lay in bed till twelve o'clock, and could not go to church to hear mass, because he had nothing to wear; for the idle scamps and loose women with whom he was constantly surrounded, knowing his weakness, frequently robbed him with impunity of his breeches, hose, and other articles of dress. In him was fulfilled the saying of a wise man:

Who waste their wealth at home must emigrate.[3]

---

[1] By the bishopric of Séez must be understood not the ecclesiastical revenues of that see, but the possession of and feudal rights over the country dependent on it, better known as the Hiémois.

[2] The castle of Gisors had been erected by William Rufus on the domain of that place belonging to the archbishop of Rouen. Theobald (Tibaud) Paganus held the fief of Gisors and that of Neaufle under the archbishop *ut casamentum*. This kind of tenure seems to have been a sort of stewardship, at least in its origin, and applied particularly to church lands.

Although the family of Paganus was ancient and distinguished, and had been for several generations in possession of Neaufle and Gisors, there was the greater imprudence in the duke's granting him the royal castle of William Rufus, the key of Normandy on this side, because the domains, the connections, the sympathies, and even the pious foundations of these lords of the castle of Gisors, were all on the other side of the Epte. In a word, it was a family of the French Vexin transplanted to Gisors, without ever taking root there. All these considerations were set aside for the sake of recompensing an act of hospitality. This was consistent with the character of Robert Curthose, but it was paying the bill for his entertainment a little too dear.

[3] The text is a rhyming hexameter verse:

"Qui sua demergunt, hi post extrania pergunt."

The Norman barons, holding cheap their own duke, and disposed to favour the cause of the king of England, resolved on transferring to him the duchy of Normandy, and sent frequent messengers to rouse his ambition to this point. Thus both parties were depraved by growing treason, and, faithless to their sovereigns, engaged in conspiracies to their injury. Some, breaking into open insurrection, flew to arms against their loyal neighbours, and stained their country's fertile soil with ravages, flames, and cruel slaughters. The venerable Archbishop Anselm, and all the bishops and abbots, with the clergy and the whole English people, adhered firmly to their own prince, and prayed without ceasing to the Lord of Sabaoth for the safety of their king and the stability of his throne.[1] Robert de Mellent also, and many other loyal and prudent barons, maintained their fealty to their lord, and supported him with their forces and their counsels.

Ranulph Flambard, bishop of Durham,[2] was the chief

[1] It was quite natural for the Norman barons, who were daily witnesses of the disorderly conduct and follies of Robert Curthose, to have more sympathy for King Henry, whose yoke, as yet easy even to his own subjects, could not be so heavy on them as on their neighbours over the sea. But the clergy on both sides the Manche were devoted to Henry, whose more regular habits and respectful conduct to the church gave no offence to public decency. There was a still more powerful motive for the ecclesiastics' predilection for the king; it was the severity with which he administered justice and maintained order in his states, the protection he gave to their persons, their property, and their revenues, against the rapacity of the nobility and soldiery. In consequence of this, the English barons in his reign complained of their straitened resources, and were anxious for a government which, less firm, would allow them to pillage and extort money at their own pleasure.

[2] For the character of this bishop, see vol. ii. pp. 466, 467. Historians are not agreed either as to the Christian or surname (or rather the nick-name) of this person. He is called *Radulfus*, *Randulfus*, and *Ranulfus*, probably three forms of the same name, and *Flambard*, or *Passeflabere*. At first he had been dean of the college of Twineham in Hampshire, but having quarrelled with the bishop, entered the service of William Rufus, becoming his chaplain as early as 1088, at which time the king made him abbot of Winchester. The year following, on the death of archbishop Lanfranc, he was appointed to administer the revenues of that see, and in 1091, those of the see of Lincoln and abbey of Chertsey were added to his charge. In 1097, the number of bishoprics and abbeys entrusted to his administration for the king's profit was sixteen, "which," say the Annals of Winton, "he reduced to extreme poverty . . . both the clergy and laity were in such distress that they were weary of their lives." Ranulf

instigator of this mad enterprise. He was a man of low origin, who, by his flatteries and crafty policy, had so crept into the favour of William Rufus, that he was raised by that king above all the nobles of the realm. Being made lord high treasurer and justiciary, he brought on himself the hatred and fear of numbers of the king's subjects, by the cruel severities with which he performed his functions. Amassing wealth and enlarging his property in all quarters, he became enormously rich, and was advanced to the episcopacy, although he was very illiterate, not for his piety, but for his worldly power. But as all earthly prosperity is of short duration, on the death of his patron, King William, the bishop was thrown into prison by the new king as an inveterate robber of his country. For the many injuries he had inflicted on Henry himself and the other children of the soil, both rich and poor, by which he had in various ways heaped constant troubles upon them, he was, thanks to divine providence which changed the current of affairs, hurled from his proud elevation,[1] and committed to the custody of William de Magnaville,[2] to be confined in fetters in the tower of London. But, as Ovid says, speaking of Dædalus:—

"The wits misfortune harpens, . ."[3]

held at the same time the offices of justiciary and treasurer. He was named to the bishopric of Durham by William Rufus on Whitsunday, May 24, 1099, and consecrated the Sunday following.

[1] Historians are not agreed respecting the exact date of Ranulf's imprisonment, varying it between the 8th and 18th of September.

[2] This person belonged to the family of Magneville, or Mandeville, afterwards earls of Essex. He appears as witness to a charter of Geoffrey de Magneville in favour of the priory of Hurley. His name occurs immediately after that of Lasceline, wife of Geoffrey, from whence it may be supposed that he was her brother. See *Mon. Anglican.* i. p. 363. It is not known from what place the numerous branches of the Norman family of Mandeville, Magneville, or Manneville sprung, but it is certain that it was not from Magneville near Valognes, which was then the property of the lords of Briquebec. It is also known that their Norman estates lay partly in the neighbourhood of Creuli (from whence M. Delisle places them at Mandeville le Trevières), and the rest round Argentan, where at a later period they held the honour of Chamboi given to William de Magneville, nephew of the person here named, by Philip d'Alsace, count of Flanders, who possessed it in right of his wife Isabel de Vermandois, heiress of the counties of the Vexin and Amiens, which were the gift of Duke Richard II. with Elbeuf on the Seine.

[3] "Ingenium mala sæpe monent."

the crafty prelate contrived his release from prison, effecting his liberation by the adroit use of his friend's assistance. Indeed, he had great ability and fluency of speech, and although he was cruel and passionate, such was his generosity and constant good humour, that he rendered himself a general favourite, and was even beloved. By the king's command, he was allowed every day two shillings for his diet while in confinement, so that, with the assistance of his friends, he fared sumptuously for a prisoner, and kept daily a splendid table for himself and his keepers. One day a cord was brought to the bishop in a flagon of wine, and, causing a plentiful banquet to be served, the guards having partaken of it in his company, washed it down with Falernian cups in the highest spirits. Having intoxicated them to such a degree that they slept soundly, the bishop secured the cord to a mullion in the centre of the tower window, and, catching up his pastoral staff, began to lower himself by means of the cord. But, now, having forgotten to put on gloves, his hands were excoriated to the bone by the rough cord, and as it did not reach the ground, the portly bishop fell, and being much bruised, groaned piteously. Faithful friends and tried followers were waiting at the foot of the tower, where they had swift horses in readiness for him, though they were in great terror.[1] Having mounted on horseback with them, they fled with the utmost speed, and escorted by his trusty companions, who had charge of his treasure, he lost no time in hastening on shipboard, and, crossing over to Normandy, presented himself to Duke Robert.

Flambard's mother, who was a sorceress, and had frequent conferences with the devil, in the course of which accursed familiarity she lost an eye, was sailing to Normandy in another ship with her son's treasure, and during the voyage was often exposed to the derision of the crew by her hellish incantations. Meanwhile, meeting with pirates on the passage, the ship was plundered of all the treasure, and the sorceress, half-naked and very sorrowful, with the guards and steersmen, was set on shore on the coast of Normandy. The fugitive bishop, being received with welcome, was entrusted with the government of the duchy; and, as far as

[1] Ranulf made his escape either on the 1st or 4th of February, 1101; it is not certain which.

his indolence permitted, Robert availed himself of his counsels. His principal object was to rouse the duke to engage in hostilities with his brother, using all his efforts to exasperate him against the king. He pointed out the best mode of securing the crown of England, and promised him his aid under all circumstances.

At length, during the autumn, Robert passed the Straits, and landing in England, and being well received by the illustrious and powerful persons who had joined the league and were expecting him, made preparations for war with the king. His fleet was vastly inferior to that with which his father had invaded England, and he landed at Portsmouth,[1] more by the contrivance of the traitorous conspirators, than by the strength of his armament. The duke was immediately conducted by those peers of the realm who had already done homage to him into the province of Winchester, where he fixed his quarters, and, at the instance of the disaffected barons, challenged his brother to battle, unless he chose to abdicate his throne. Many of the nobles who had hitherto kept appearances with the king, welcomed the duke on his landing, and augmented his army with their troops.[2] Thus Robert de Belèsme, William, earl of Surrey, and several more, deserted from the king's standard; while many others, that they might find pretexts for leaving him, preferred unjust demands, threatening that they would

[1] Robert Curthose embarked at Tréport, and landed at Portsmouth the 1st of August. King Henry expected him in the neighbourhood of Hastings, that part of the coast being the point of a regular course of navigation, but the duke deranged his combinations by landing at Portsmouth, from which place he marched towards Winchester.

[2] The English were much embarrassed in deciding to which of the two brothers they should give the preference. Henry had in their eyes two great advantages, that of having married the heiress of the line of their Anglo-Saxon kings, and that of having been born after the Conquest, and of being consequently what the Greeks of the Lower Empire called *Porphyrogenites*. But the people of England had not yet recovered from the terror of the Norman arms which the battle of Hastings had inspired. Henry was compelled to have the English troops often arranged in his own presence, and to teach them himself military exercises and the use of arms to give them some degree of confidence on the field of battle. The Norman lords, indignant at all these attentions to the sympathies and wants of a conquered race, called Henry in derision Godric, and his wife Goddith, or Godiva.

abandon his cause unless their pretensions were satisfied. On the other hand Robert de Mellent, Richard de Revières, and many other stout barons, rallied round their king. The people of England, to a man, repudiating the claims of the other prince, were firm in their loyalty to their native king, and demanded to be led to battle for him.

Meanwhile, Hugh, earl of Chester, took to his bed, and, after a long illness, having taken the monastic habit in the abbey founded by himself at Chester, died in the course of three days, on the sixth of the calends of August [July 27].[1] His son Richard, a young man of handsome person, his only child, by Ermentrudo, daughter of Hugh de Claremont, succeeded to the earldom, which he held for nearly twelve years, beloved by all. He married Matilda, daughter of Stephen, count de Blois, by Adele, sister of King Henry, but they both unhappily perished in the wreck of the Blanche-Neuf, on the seventh of the calends of December [November 27], as will be hereafter fully related.[2]

The earl of Mellent, observing the plots and defection of his countrymen, and endeavouring to keep his fealty to his friend and sovereign, in adversity as well as prosperity, reflected secretly with much acuteness on the state of affairs, and used every exertion that the settlement of the crown should not be shaken. He therefore said to the king: "Every honest and just man, when he sees his friend in distress, ought, if he wishes to have his faithfulness believed, to employ all his efforts to succour that friend in time of need. In doing this, he should look less to the future reward of his services than to the means in his power for rendering aid. But we see many persons acting quite otherwise, and staining their honour by a shameful breach of the

[1] Hugh Lupus, viscount of Avranches and earl of Chester, who has been so often mentioned before, had brought St. Anselm to England in 1092 to restore the ancient monastery of St. Werburgh at Chester, in which he substituted Benedictine monks for the regular canons who had before occupied it. See *Monast. Anglic.* i. 199. His wife was daughter of Hugh, count de Clermont in Beauvoisis, and of Margaret de Rouci.

[2] Richard, earl of Chester, son of Hugh Lupus, married Matilda of Blois, niece of Henry I., and perished with her in the shipwreck of the Blanche-Neuf, after enjoying his hereditary honours, not twelve, but nineteen years.

fealty they have pledged to their lord. Doubtless, this is clear enough, and it causes us the most poignant inward pain. We, however, to whom the care of the commonwealth is divinely committed, ought to look well to the safety of the realm and the church of God. It should be our chief concern, that, by God's grace, we may live in peace, gain the victory without the effusion of Christian blood, and that the loyal people may live in the enjoyment of a state of tranquillity. Now, then, my lord king, listen to my advice, and condescend to follow my counsels. Speak graciously to all your knights; caress them as a father does his children; soothe them with promises, granting their requests, and in this manner adroitly conciliate the attachment of all your adherents. If they should even ask for London or York, do not hesitate to make magnificent promises, befitting a royal liberality. It is better to give away a small portion of the kingdom, than, by making a number of enemies, to lose both victory and life. When, however, we get happily to the end of this affair, by God's help, useful advice can be given as to reclaiming the domains which treasonable deserters may have usurped during the war. It is certain that whoever voluntarily deserts his lord when in peril of his life, and attaches himself to another for love of gain, or makes a market to his king of the military service which he is bound to give freely for the defence of the realm, and attempts to rob him of his royal domains, should in the eyes of justice and equity be considered a traitor, and, incurring the forfeiture of his hereditary estates, be driven into exile."[1]

All the great men who were present approved the earl's discourse and advised the king to follow his advice. Henry, who was endowed with great sagacity, thanked his faithful counsellors and fully acquiesced in their prudent recommendation. He therefore conciliated by promises and gifts many of the lords whose fidelity was suspected. At length, he advanced with a powerful army to meet his brother, sending envoys to him with instructions to demand dis-

[1] Although it is impossible to vouch for the authenticity of this discourse, its tenor is quite in harmony with what we know of the very relaxed notions of honour entertained both by Robert de Mellent and his sovereign.

tinctly for what reason he dared to enter England at the head of armed troops. Robert sent the following answer by his own messengers: "I have come to the kingdom of my father, in company with my barons, to claim it as my own by right of primo-geniture."

The two brothers pitched their camps near each other for some days on a certain level tract,[1] and interchanged messengers by noble envoys. The turbulent traitors desired war rather than peace, and looking more to their private advantage than the public good, their wily emissaries perverted the words of the princes, and promoted strife rather than concord between the brothers. The wise Henry soon discovered this, and in consequence sought a conference with his brother face to face, and on their meeting both felt the gentle influence of brotherly affection. Their numerous troops formed a magnificent circle round them, displaying the terrible but brilliant spectacle of the Normans and English under arms. The two brothers met unattended in the centre and conversed together in the presence of the troops, and while all eyes were fixed upon them, they gave free vent to the thoughts of their hearts by words of sincerity. After a short conversation they embraced each other with loving kisses, and were reconciled without reserve. I cannot insert here the words used at this conference, not having been present at it, but I have learnt from what I heard the results of this meeting of the illustrious brothers.

Imprimis, Duke Robert renounced the claim which he had preferred to the crown of England in favour of his brother, and released him, in consideration of his royal dignity, from the homage he had paid him a long while before. On his part, King Henry engaged to pay his brother yearly three thousand pounds sterling, and ceded to him the whole county of Coutances and all his other possessions in Normandy, except Damfront. He retained the castle of Damfront only, because he had pledged his oath to the people

[1] According to Wace, whose authority is somewhat doubtful, the two brothers met in a forest district called Hantone (Hampton), probably near Hampton Court. It may be that Robert Curthose marched in this direction in consequence of having learnt that his sister-in-law had not recovered from the effects of childbirth at Winchester, at which city it was his original design to take up his position.

there, when they gave him admission, never to let the place pass out of his own hands, nor to change their laws and customs. The brothers agreed on the articles of their treaty without the intervention of any umpires, and, in the sight of all those who formed the circle round them and beheld them with admiration, resolved that they would mutually aid each other as brothers should, that they would recover all the territories possessed by their father, and would punish on both sides, those who had infamously sown dissension between them.[1]

Peace being thus concluded, the traitors were covered with confusion, and became contemptible even to those on whom they had lavished their flatteries, being compelled in disgrace and pale with fear to fly from the presence of the king. The loyal commons, devoted to their honest labours, were clamorous with joy, and the armed troops were disbanded by the king's licence and returned rejoicing to their respective abodes. The whole realm of England enjoyed the still delight of renewed tranquillity, and the church of God, flourishing during a long season of repose, exhibited the beauty of the divine law, and rendered its service to God in security, undisturbed by the clash of arms.

The truth of our account is evidenced by the number of new churches and chantries recently erected in the villages of England, as well as by the cloistered buildings of the abbeys and other monastic offices constructed during King Henry's reign. For all the religious orders, being in the enjoyment of peace and prosperity, rivalled each other in manifesting their zeal in all that belongs to the worship of the omnipotent Deity, both internally and externally. In the fervour of their devotion the faithful undertook to demolish the temples and habitations that they might substitute for them edifices on a better scale. The buildings which were erected in the times of Edgar, Edward, and other Christian kings, were therefore levelled to the ground, that they might be succeeded by others, larger and loftier, and of more elegant architecture, to the Creator's glory.

[1] Ordericus omits mentioning what might have proved the most important article in this treaty to the interests of Robert Curthose, the provision that "the survivor of the two brothers should be heir to the other, dying without issue." Henry of Huntingdon, p. 240; *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.*

Duke Robert spent two months with his brother the king, and then, as winter approached, returned to Normandy loaded with royal gifts, and taking with him William de Warrenne and several others who had been disinherited for their share in his enterprise.

A short time afterwards Gilbert, surnamed Maminot,[1] the bishop of Lisieux[2] died in the month of August at an advanced age, upon which Fulcher, the brother of Flambard was consecrated bishop of that see by William the archbishop in the month of June. Being almost illiterate, he had to thank his brother's interest for pushing him forward from attendance at court to become a bishop. However his munificence was commendable; and having filled the see only seven months, he died in January following. Then Ralph Flambard, who lived in Normandy, a banished man, and was deprived of his bishopric of Durham by the king's hatred of him, obtained the see of Lisieux for his son Thomas a mere child, governing it himself for three years, not as a bishop but as a provost. Meanwhile William de Paci bought the

[1] Gilbert Maminot, bishop of Lisieux, has been often mentioned in the preceding history. See in particular, vol. ii. pp. 121, 402, and this vol. p. 62, with the note.

It appears from one of these passages that he was son of a brave knight, Robert de Courbepine, near Bernai. We find Ralph de Courbepine settled in Kent soon after the Conquest, and having a lawsuit with Archbishop Lanfranc before Hugh de Montford, respecting lands in the Isle of Thanet.

Besides persons of the name of Courbepine, there were some of the name of Maminot in England after the Conquest. Walkelin Maminot, in particular, restored to the monks of Shrewsbury a farm which had been unjustly taken from them by Hamon Peverel, his uncle.

[2] According to the obituary of Lisieux, Fulcher died the 29th of January, 1102.

[3] *Præses.* When Ranulf got possession of the bishopric of Lisieux in the name of his son Thomas, he stipulated that in case of that son's death he should be replaced by one of his other children. This scandal only lasted three years, at the end of which the duke, on the remonstrances of the archbishop of Rouen and the neighbouring bishops, resolved at last to put an end to it. Still the see of Lisieux did not yet find the end of its misfortunes, nor escape from the toils of Ranulf. William, archdeacon of Lisieux, was at first elected bishop; a good choice, but the archbishop was suspended from his functions, and none of the suffragans would undertake to perform them. Upon this, Ranulf presented one of his clerks named William de Paci, who was rejected for simony. After the battle of Tinchebrai, Hervey, bishop of Bangor, wished to exchange his see for that of

bishopric for a large sum of money paid to the count, but being condemned for his simony, first at Rouen and afterwards at Rome, he paid dearly for his presumption. Thus Lisieux was without a guide for nearly five years, and the Lord's flock, having no worthy pastor, became a prey to ravening wolves, till God's mercy sent John to be its bishop for the consolation of the faithful.

CH. XIX. *The second Crusade—Nobles who joined it—Stephen, count de Blois, who had deserted from the first—Arrival at Constantinople—Duplicity of the emperor Alexius—Failure of the expedition.*

FAVOURABLE intelligence having been received respecting the illustrious champions who had undertaken the pilgrimage and gloriously triumphed in the east, fighting against the Gentiles in Christ's name, the nobles of the west were envious of their invincible valour and unexpected success. In consequence numbers were inspired with zeal to become pilgrims, and visiting the tomb of our Lord and the holy places, exercise their valour and skill in arms against the Turks. Many were compelled to the crusade by the terrors of the apostolical censure, for Pope Paschal had excommunicated and cut off from the Christian privileges all those who, having voluntarily taken the cross, had returned without accomplishing their enterprise, unless they engaged a second time in the journey they had relinquished, and making satisfaction to God religiously performed their vows.

In the year, therefore, of our Lord 1101, William, duke of Poitiers,[1] collected a large army from Aquitaine and Gascony, and commenced with spirit his journey to Jerusalem. He was bold and brave and so facetious that even comic players could not equal the variety of his numerous jokes. It is reported that three hundred thousand armed men marched under his standard when he crossed the borders of Aquitaine.

Lisieux. In short, this church, as our author states, was not restored to a state of repose till the election of John, archdeacon of Séez, in 1107.

[1] William, the seventh of that name, as count of Poitiers, and the ninth as duke of Aquitaine, born the 22nd of September, 1071, was a nobleman of the most depraved habits, both before and after his pilgrimage to the Holy Land. We are told that he bore on his shield the portrait of the wife of one of his viscounts with whom he was in love, and that he had the impudence to found an abbey of loose women.

Stephen count palatine of Blois, received reproaches without end, and was scouted by all the world, for having ignominiously withdawn from the siege of Antioch, and deserted his gallant companions in arms, when they were suffering martyrdom for the cause of Christ.[1] Being frequently reproved by a variety of persons for this conduct, Stephen was compelled both by fear and shame to undertake a fresh crusade. Among others his wife Adele often urged him to it, reminding him of it even amidst the endearments of conjugal caresses. "Far be it from you, my lord," she said, "to submit any longer to the jibes you receive from all quarters. Pluck up the courage for which you were renowned in your youth, and take arms in a noble cause for the salvation of thousands, so that Christians may have good reason to exult in all parts of the world, to the terror of the pagans and the public humiliation of their detestable religion."

This was the sort of language that clever and spirited woman often addressed to her husband. He certainly had already sufficiently experienced the perils and difficulties of the enterprise to make him shrink from undergoing such toils again. At length however he took courage, and putting himself on his march at the head of many thousand French, persevered, against most formidable obstacles, until he reached the tomb of our Lord. At that time Hirpin[2] sold the city of Bourges to Philip king of France, and joined the crusade with Joscelin de Courtenai,[3] and Milo de Brai.[4]

Meanwhile, Duke Stephen,[5] Stephen count of the Saone,[6]

[1] As to the ignominious desertion of the count de Blois during the siege of Antioch, see before p. 133.

[2] Eudes Hirpin, son of Humbaud, lord of Dun, was viscount of Bourges in right of his wife Mahaud, daughter of Gillon de Sulli, mentioned before p. 230. Having been taken prisoner at Ramla, he owed his deliverance to the intervention of the emperor Alexius, as related in cc. xxii. and xxiii. of the present book. He finished his days at Cluni, where he had made his profession of a monk, in 1109.

[3] Joscelin de Courtenai, second of that name, and the second son of Joscelin I., remained in the Holy Land, where he became count of Edessa.

[4] Milo de Brai joined the first crusade, and died in it, so that he could not have been engaged in the second; and Milo, his second son, was too young at this time to be the person of whom our author meant to speak.

[5] The duke of Burgundy, who went to the Holy Land in 1101, was not named Stephen, but Eudes.

[6] It is supposed that the person described by our author under the title

and another Stephen who was son of Richelde,[1] hastened to assume the cross in company with a great body of the warriors of Burgundy. Likewise, the archbishop of Milan and Albert de Blandrai, the most powerful of the Italian nobles,[2] put themselves en route for Jerusalem with Ligurian troops. All these crusaders, having undertaken the pilgrimage for the love of God, on reaching Macedonia sent envoys to the emperor Alexius demanding a free passage through his dominions and the liberty of marketing for supplies.

The crafty emperor was greatly alarmed when he heard of the approach of so powerful a Western army, and prudently flattered their pride by readily granting all that they required. Having had frequent experience of the daring valour of the Cisalpine troops under Guiscard and Bohemond, he took every precaution against giving the crusaders umbrage and provoking hostilities. For this reason he granted them a free passage through his territories and liberally acquiesced in all the demands they made. After loading the chiefs with munificent presents, he caused the whole army to be conducted in safety as far as Cappadocia, which is beyond Constantinople. There they mustered all the Western people, and found that the force amounted to fifty thousand fighting men.

Having consulted well-informed persons on the route they were to take, they took precautions for avoiding the dangers it presented. These imminent perils were the subject of their

of *Comes super-Saonensis*, was Stephen, uncle and guardian of William II., who assumed the title of count of Burgundy during the minority of his ward.

[1] This vague designation has not led to the discovery of any information respecting the Burgundian noble.

[2] Ordericus makes use of too strong an expression when he calls this crusader the most powerful of the Italian nobles. He was the first count on record of Biandrati, a small town three leagues and a half west of Vercelli, and two and a half west of Novarra. All that is known concerning him is that he was one of the negociators between the emperor and Pope Paschal II., and went as our author states to the Holy Land, from which he soon returned. He was dead before 1120, a time when his wife Poma or Roma, and his son Guy, who was yet in the cradle, figure in an historical poem entitled, *Mediolanensium in Comenses Bellum*. Guy married a daughter of William IV., marquis of Montserrat. See *Muratori, Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, t. v.

consultations, and they talked of them among each other in such language as the following: "Thus far we have been in security, having had to do with our brethren with whose habits and language we are familiar. From the hour we left our own homes till the present we have travelled through Christian countries where we have been well received for the love of the Father Almighty. Now a different lot awaits us. The storm of war is fiercely raging between the emperor and Bohemond who commands at Antioch. The regions which we have to traverse are a waste, through which the Turks make frequent irruptions towards the sea-coast, breathing slaughter on all who bear the Christian name as naturally as wolves thirst for the blood of the flocks. Let us humbly implore Almighty God to protect us in the great dangers which surround us on every side. We leave in our rear this faithless emperor and his people, with great reason to suspect them of treachery. On our right is the sea in which lie Crete, Cyprus, the far-famed Rhodes, and many other islands, all which owe allegiance to the emperor, and detest us for the misconduct of those of our countrymen who have preceeded us. To the east and north, the country is occupied to the extremity of the globe by barbarous nations who are inflamed with insatiable ardour to shed Christian blood. The march to Antioch will take more than thirty days, through deserts in which we shall find no means of subsistence as the fertile spots have been left uncultivated in consequence of the long wars between the emperor and Bohemond. Environed by so many perils, what are we to do? All is desolation around."

At length[1] the duke of Poitiers, having listened with attention to the various opinions which were offered, said to the council: "Let us despatch envoys to the emperor with our unanimous request that he will send us the count of St. Giles with our Saviour's holy spear; for he will lead us in safety through these unknown countries to the tomb of our Lord. The count has great wisdom, and his influence is powerful; in the first expedition he was considered on all occasions as one of the most distinguished of the crusaders.

[1] Many of our author's details connected with this crusade are fabulous, commencing with this paragraph.

His personal knowledge of the difficulties of the march will supply our inexperience, and his proved valour has been long known both to Christians and Pagans. If we have him at our head as our Maro[1] and counsellor, we shall obtain security with respect to the emperor, and he will take wise precautions against the infidels."

Envoys were accordingly dispatched by common consent, who with much eloquence laid before the emperor the object of their mission; and after listening to the message of the Italian chiefs, he reported it without delay to Count Raymond. His reply was as follows: "By God's grace, through many perils, I devoted all my powers to the recovery of Jerusalem; but now, feeling the burden of years and impaired by my exertions, I wish to spend the rest of my days in tranquillity. For this purpose, my lord emperor, I sought an asylum at the court of your majesty. Excuse me then, I pray you, and do not force me to engage in another expedition." The emperor then communicated his reply to the ambassadors: "I have entreated," he said, "the court of St. Giles to join your company, but he alleges that his age and infirmities will not allow him to take part in the enterprise. Go forward, relying on peace with us. As to the illustrious count who has placed himself under the protection of our majesty, I cannot send him away, for I have not the right to do so."

The envoys immediately returned and reported what they had heard. As it caused great perturbation, and the chiefs vented their thoughts in various murmurs, William of Poitiers thus addressed them: "Let us instantly fly to arms and, by a counter march, lay siege to Constantinople; and stoutly assaulting the city, we will not draw off till we either put to death this perfidious emperor, or wring from him, however reluctantly, what we demand. He has brought destruction on thousands of the faithful by his treacheries, and I think therefore that he who by any means shall take the life of one whose occupation of the country is the cause of so much loss, will offer a sacrifice acceptable to God."

Stephen of Blois and some other lords who were for tempe-

[1] Virgil. In the middle age this poet was considered as a powerful enchanter. In this instance his name is used in the sense of guide or counsellor.

rate counsels did not acquiesce in this proposal, which they joined in opposing, alleging arguments founded on right reason. However, the Aquitanians and Gascons, with other insubordinate troops, preferring to be led by juvenile imprudence, supported the rash proposal of the young duke. They therefore returned by a hasty march, and sat down before Byzantium for three days. The emperor, when he first heard of their design, was disposed to treat it lightly, considering the vast population of his capital, and that it was fortified by triple lines of circumvallation. But finding that they persisted in their enterprise, he commanded three most savage lions and seven leopards to be let loose in the area between the two exterior walls. He also posted guards on the third wall, to which the palaces of the nobles in the interior of the place adjoined, and caused the gates to be firmly closed, thinking thus, in scorn, to deter the Franks from their attack through fear of the wild beasts, and defend the imperial city without employing human means. But the crafty wiles of man are fruitless when they are not aided by Divine Providence. The Franks, after standing to arms in their camp, seeing that there was no show of resistance, entered the outer gate eager for conflict, and searched with enquiring eyes on all sides for the defenders of their country. However, no sooner had they entered than the fierce lions unexpectedly attacked their foremost ranks with great rage, and tearing them with their fangs and claws, severely wounded some of the troops, unaccustomed as they were to encounter wild beasts.[1]

But such a contest with the skill of man could not last long. The soldiers transfixed the lions with spears and darts, and having destroyed the lions, drove off the leopards, pursuing them to the foot of the middle wall, which the leopards crossed, creeping up them like cats. The Franks passed through the gate in this second wall, and made a bold assault on the third. The citizens now raised loud cries, and there was horrible confusion, all the people running together and not knowing what they should do in this

[1] We find Ordericus occasionally unscrupulous in the use of the materials he collected from all quarters for his vast undertaking, particularly in his account of the crusades. This story of the lions, has the appearance of having been the invention of some ignorant pilgrim or wandering minstrel.

sudden emergency. The emperor hearing the noise of this unexpected attack was struck with terror, lamenting the failure of his false hopes. At last he sent a suppliant message to the noble pilgrims, and contriving to soothe their wrath by a variety of promises, induced them to draw off from the assault of his capital, the defence of which they were on the point of carrying by storm.

While the victorious Franks returned to their tents, the sorrowful emperor summoned the count of Tholouse to his presence, and in his grief and utter dismay thus addressed him: "Illustrious count, I have recourse to you in great tribulation and ask your advice, what is to be done in this most unexpected disaster. The insolence of the Franks has led them to make an audacious attack on the imperial city, the capital of the East. They have violated the dignity of the holy empire and reduced me to become a suppliant to prevent the worst. They have shed the blood of my faithful subjects, and provoked the wrath of Divine Providence. The imperial majesty, which used to give laws both to the natives and foreigners, is now, alas! compelled to submit to conditions imposed by insolent pilgrims." Count Raymond replied: "My countrymen are well practised in such assaults, and I well know their fierce attacks under such circumstances against their own neighbours. Your majesty's wisdom does not require the aid of long explanations. You must lose no time in making terms with this daring host. The public interest requires it; but, if I mistake not, it will cost the lives of many of them. These audacious Gascons demand that I shall join their expedition, they would insolently make me a pilgrim whether I am willing or not.

"They'll rue the day they urged the rash design."[1]

I deeply grieve, mighty emperor, the affront offered to the holy empire; but at present I will not give utterance to all that is passing in my mind. A time for vengeance will come when these miscreants will have to expiate their outrageous offence. Behold, the walls of Constantinople are reeking with the blood of her sons; a spectacle which, shame to say, we have now before our eyes."

[1] *Non impune ferent, ausis quod talibus hærent.*

Such was the nature of the conference between the emperor and the count, and they contrived measures by which they would avenge themselves on the enemy for the annoyance they had caused. Alexius made choice of illustrious envoys, and sent them to the Franks to guarantee his engagements by their oaths, and convey humble supplications that the army would peaceably withdraw and wait for the arrival of the count in Cappadocia with twenty thousand Turcopoles. Having received the promise of the emperor ratified on oath, the Franks withdrew, and rested for a while, preparing for their march. The count followed them a few days afterwards, and the emperor despatched, ships loaded with tartarons, and commanded them to be distributed among all the troops in the army according to their order and rank. The Thracians call tartarons the square copper coins which the inhabitants of Thrace and Bithynia use in traffic like philips or bezants. The needy pilgrims received with eagerness the emperor's bounty, not suspecting the perfidy and deep policy of that worst of traitors. The crafty spy by this contrivance counted their force, reckoning the numbers of the receivers by the sum of money he gave to each. He then sent an account of their numerical force to Daliman, Soliman, and the rest of the Turkish chiefs, exhorting them to assemble the whole strength of paganism and attack them in Paphlagonia.

Our countrymen, not suspecting any fraud, and exulting at being joined by the count, commenced their march with the Turcopoles in the van, who were acquainted with the language and manners of the Getes, as well as the roads; but the Franks were led astray, and after wandering about and surmounting great difficulties, reached a large city of the barbarians called Gandras. In short, they left entirely on their right the road leading through Romania and Syria to Jerusalem, and turned aside through Pontus, formerly the kingdom of Mithridates, who ruled over twenty kings, until at length, marching northward, they entered Paphlagonia. I am not sufficiently informed whether the count of St. Giles thus deviated from the direct road by mistake, or whether he led his allies astray vindictively to satisfy his malice. The Christians having crossed a rough country, with dangerous rivers and impervious forests, and at last arrived at

Gandras after a three weeks' journey, they resolved to rest there for a time after their great fatigues. Then, however, a multitude of Pagans, innumerable as the sands of the sea, fell on them when they little expected it, and weary as they were with severe toil. The barbarians, on their side, brought with them their wives, their flocks and herds, and dragged along great stores of wealth in waggons, in order to guard carefully the mass of their substance in person, and displaying their riches to their enemies as well as their friends and countrymen, strike terror into all who witnessed their abundance; and, in short, to show that whether at home or at war they revelled in all kind of delights. Meanwhile the Christians, although exhausted by hunger and thirst and other privations, when they began to be pressed by the enemy's attack, forgot their past sufferings, and flying to arms with renewed strength and courage, formed their ranks, and fought manfully in the name of God for five days. As pilgrims worthy of credit have informed me, there were assembled fifty thousand Christians, and they were fiercely attacked, if I mistake not, by a million of pagans. The conflict was maintained with the utmost vigour on both sides, and many thousands fell. On the fifth day, the Turks finding their squdrons weakened, and utterly dismayed at the invincible courage of the Christians, received general orders to direct their wives, who remained in their tents, with the eunuchs and other domestics who had the care of the valuables belonging to the chiefs, to privately pack all their household effects, and the rest of the wealth, so that they might be prepared for a hasty retreat from the presence of the enemy the ensuing night. The Christians, however, not having discovered that the Turkish troops were giving way, shamefully retreated themselves; for night coming on, count Raymond with the imperial Turcopoles and provincial troops, fell to the rear, and commenced their flight stealthily without communicating with the other chiefs. The count's squire, finding this, struck his lord's pavilion, in compassionate consideration for the Christian army, that the comrades he had betrayed might learn his flight. Albert de Blandrai, a very brave knight, was slain in the battle, with many thousand of the Franks, but I am not informed of the exact number.

The duke of Poitiers and Stephen of Blois, and several other chiefs, with their followers, being apprised of the treacherous retreat of their comrades, were seized with a panic, and losing all command of themselves, thought only of escaping by various roads. Meanwhile, the Turks, although they had been so nearly overpowered that they were meditating flight themselves, finding that the Franks were departed, regained their courage, and pursuing the enemy fell on their rear and cut down many thousands of the fugitives. Some of them who were in the prime of youth were carried off into captivity; nearly forty thousand Christians suffered bodily death. May they live spiritually in eternal rest with Christ, in whose cause they fell![1]

The count of Tholouse, with his own followers, and the Turcopoles continued their flight to Constantinople, and reported the lamentable disaster of the Christians to the emperor's great satisfaction. Moreover, Daliman and Soliman and the other chiefs of the hostile race triumphed in the pomp of victory and restored to Alexius the whole amount of tartarons which he had perfidiously distributed among the Christians under colour of charity, besides sending him one half of all the booty they had taken from their defeated enemies. Such was the agreement which that false traitor had made with the Turks, and such the terms on which he sold the faithful to the infidels; and he gloried in his cunning as he recovered the vast sum of tartarons, the price of his treachery.

The illustrious dukes of Aquitaine and Burgundy and other brave knights made their escape from the slaughter, and concealed themselves in dens and caverns and thick woods as opportunity offered. In those regions Syrians and Armenians dwelt among the barbarians, their habitations being scattered through the country, and were under subjection to the Turks, paying an annual tribute to purchase peace and security; but although tried by persecutions like gold in the furnace, they zealously adhered to the Christian faith. In consequence, deeply deploring the defeat

[1] The details of this narrative of the rout and extermination of the Christian army, are imaginary, and merit no attention; the foundation only is true. Count Raymond, who only advanced to Tortosa, had already left the crusaders, and thus accidentally escaped sharing their disaster.

sustained by the crusaders, and sympathizing in their sufferings, as brothers, they lent them all the services of humanity as far as fear of their infidel tyrants permitted. Concealing the fugitives in their secret retreats, and supplying them with food, they took advantage of the darkness of the night to put them on the road to Antioch, conducting them in safety to the territories of neighbours and countrymen in whom they could trust. Many were dragged into captivity by the barbarians among unknown countries, and retained for some time in servitude or bonds among a people whose language they did not understand. There, serving the most High God aright, they experienced his mercy, and were succoured by him in various ways, like the Israelites among the Assyrians or Chaldeans. In consequence, many returned from captivity either by making their escape or by permission of the princes in Persia and other nations.

With the assistance of the merciful Creator, who is near to all who love him, about a hundred thousand of the Christians accomplished their escape, some of whom retraced their steps through Illyrium and others pursued their journey surrounded by alarms and difficulties. The duke of Poitiers who left the Limousin at the head of three hundred thousand armed men, and had struck terror into the emperor by his too daring assault of Constantinople, with great difficulty reached Antioch, with only six companions, and reduced to poverty and want. Other chiefs of the crusaders, and gallant counts and officers lost all their troops, and, separated from their attached followers and stripped of their wealth, were exposed to utter desolation in the midst of barbarism. Reanimated, however, by their consistancy in the true faith and their love of the merciful Jesus, they hastened to his tomb, and although, in the mysterious providence of God they were retarded by many obstacles, yet, with hearts cheered by the spiritual nectar, they shrunk from no toils on their pilgrimage to the holy places, to become partakers in blood with the blessed martyrs, who having shed it for Christ are crowned with the laurels of triumph in the heavens.

CH. XX. *Death of Godfrey, king of Jerusalem—He is succeeded by Baldwin—Stephen of Blois arrives at Jerusalem—The duke of Poitiers returns to France.*

GODFREY, king of Jerusalem, reigned only two years,[1] during which he was almost always in arms against the Philistines, and sustained by his great courage enlarged the boundaries of his kingdom. The native Gentiles observed a doubtful peace in their towns and villages, and did not even dare to whisper in public a word against the Christians. But, filled with sorrow, they secretly plotted the ruin of their new lords, watching cunningly for an opportunity of effecting their purpose. At last the citizens of Joppa contrived to poison King Godfrey[2] during his abode there, and thus cut off that glorious prince to the great sorrow of the Christians. He was the first Christian prince, from the time of our Saviour's suffering on our behalf at Jerusalem, who wore a diadem there, to the praise of him who, for the salvation of men, condescended to wear a crown of thorns; being compelled by ecclesiastical election to accept the title of King of Jerusalem,[3] that he might be a terror to the Gentiles. Having perished in the manner I described, measures were immediately taken for appointing a successor. The king's death was announced to his brother Baldwin, and he was invited to accept the crown of Jerusalem in the place of Godfrey. Entrusting without loss of time the government of his principality to his cousin Baldwin de Burg,[4] he himself traversed hostile countries and barbarous tribes with the speed of lightning. At Sarepta, a city of the Sidonians, he encountered a host of nearly forty thousand pagans, and charging them manfully at the head of a small number of troops, they were miraculously struck with

[1] That is from the 25th of June, 1099, to the 17th of July, 1100.

[2] This charge is quite gratuitous. Godfrey was labouring under severe illness when he arrived at Joppa, insomuch that he could not any longer ride on horseback.

[3] Our author makes here another grave mistake. It is well known that Godfrey expressly refused to assume the title of king, or to wear a crown or any other ensigns of royal dignity in the city where our Saviour wore a crown of thorns. It is difficult to say what Ordericus means by "ecclesiastical election." Godfrey owed his elevation to the choice of the brave chiefs of the crusaders.

[4] Baldwin de Burg, second son of Hugh, count de Retel.

panic, and Baldwin, by God's help, put them all to flight, and continued his journey to Jerusalem in triumph. The Turks, apprized of his approach, had posted their troops under arms in an ambuscade on his road, promising themselves signal success; but their ill-founded hopes were foiled, and those who were able to escape returned to their homes in confusion, with loss and disgrace.

The prince of whom I am speaking, being well received by the people of Jerusalem, ascended the throne of David, and maintained himself on it with vigour for nearly twelve years.[1] Baldwin was personally handsome, of lofty stature, distinguished for daring courage, indefatigable in the most toilsome enterprises, well imbued with learning, an accomplished speaker, and endowed with many virtues. During his reign, Stephen of Blois and the other chiefs of whom I have spoken, arrived at Jerusalem after many disasters, and were honourably received by King Baldwin and Ebremar the patriarch.[2] The duke of Poitiers, having performed his devotions at the holy places, returned to his own states with some of his company, and being of a cheerful and witty turn, when afterwards he was restored to a state of prosperity he made the sufferings he had undergone during his captivity a subject for amusement among kings, and nobles, and Christian assemblies, descanting on them in rhyming verses to merry tunes. On the contrary, Stephen of Blois and several other crusaders remained in Judea for the love of Christ, resolved to consecrate their strength and valour to his service, waiting for the attack of the king of Babylon, who, they learnt, was on his march at the head of an innumerable army.

[1] Baldwin was crowned on Christmas-day, 1100. He died the 7th of April, 1118, and consequently not in the twelfth but the eighteenth year of his reign. Our author's accounts of affairs in the Holy Land are not very exact. It is probable that in the preceding paragraph he alludes to the victory gained by Baldwin over the Egyptians between Ascalon and Ramla.

[2] Ebremar, an ecclesiastic of worthy conduct, but extremely ignorant, was elected patriarch in 1103, after Daimbert, who was always engaged in quarrels with Baldwin, had retired to Antioch. When Stephen of Blois, who died at the battle of Ramla, May 27, 1102, came to Jerusalem, Daimbert, not Ebremar, must have been patriarch.

CH. XXI.—*Wars of King Baldwin—The crusaders besieged in Ramla—Baldwin escapes to Jerusalem.*

INTELLIGENCE being received that there was no doubt the emir[1] of Babylon had reached Ascalon, and was resolved to attack the Christians the next day with a large force, King Baldwin, and Stephen, and the rest of the faithful encouraged each other in the Lord Jesus, and devoutly armed themselves in his name either for a glorious victory or fatal end. Part of the army was detached to Joppa, while the king and most of the nobles marched to Ramla, being averse to be shut up in Jerusalem, and not knowing what place the Turks would first attack. At last the emir, by a sudden movement, invested Ramla with an immense force, assaulting the walls with missile weapons and various engines of war, and endeavouring to sap them by trenching and mining. There were some brave knights in the place, but their numbers were small, and their strength was not sufficient to resist such vast numbers. In consequence, Stephen and Harpin, and William Sans-Avoir,[2] with some others, persuaded the king to depart for Jerusalem with the utmost despatch. "Hasten," they said, "brave king, to return to the holy city, lest it should be beset by this immense army while it has no protector, and the mother and her children perish by a sudden assault. We are here blockaded in a similar manner, and expect assuredly that our end is at hand in the confession of Christ, imploring our Creator from the depth of our hearts that we may become his true martyrs, and being cleansed from all our sins by shedding our blood in his name, be admitted in company with the saints to behold his face beaming with mercy on ourselves. Farewell, good king; sally forth without delay, although the passage through such hosts of fierce enemies is perilous, unless you are attended by God's mercy."

The anxious barons, addressing the king in these words and others of the same kind, compelled him to escape from one danger by incurring another still greater. Godfrey

[1] *Admirabilis*; a curious perversion of the oriental title.

[2] Mentioned before, p. 75, with his uncle Walter de Poissi, and his three brothers, Walter, Simon, and Matthew. William and Simon fell in the battle of Ramla.

with great reluctance submitted to the advice of these renowned warriors, and mounting a swift and powerful mare, called Farise,[1] he left Ramla in the night, and attended by a single trooper, by the protection of God passed through the enemy's troops unmolested. He had got beyond the camp while it was still dark, and was making his way towards Jerusalem by by-paths when the sentinels who were on the watch, finding that some strange soldiers had passed, gave the alarm, and rousing the troops, pursued the fugitives for two miles with cries and yells. The king, however, being well acquainted with the by-roads, by God's help, made his escape unhurt, although with the utmost difficulty; for he was obliged to leave in his alarm the mountain track to Jerusalem on which he had entered, and by crossing some precipitous heights with great toil, reached a town called Arsur,[2] where he found the guards watching in great trepidation. He immediately addressed them, and begged them to admit him, but met with a repulse; for the warders, although he repeated, "I am Baldwin—you have nothing to fear; admit me among you," were so terrified at the various stratagems practised by the enemy that they would not believe him until they had kindled a fire on the walls, and on his taking off his helmet his features were recognized. They then opened the gate with joy, and entering the place, he encouraged the garrison, and telling them the state of affairs, exhorted them to defend the place.

The king then mounted his gazelle,[3] and with his fellow soldiers rode with all speed to Joppa. Being well known there, the townsmen admitted him without hesitation, and he communicated to them the disastrous state of affairs. "Countless hordes of pagans," he said, "are besieging Ramla, and the garrison are in danger of their lives from the desperate assaults. That illustrious warrior Stephen, count palatine of Blois, Milo de Brai, Harpin de Bourges, William Sans-Avoir, and Simon his brother, with other brave knights, are devoting themselves to martyrdom at

[1] An Arab mare, celebrated for its speed, to which Baldwin owed his safety on several occasions. He called her his gazelle.

[2] A town on the coast, between Cesarea and Joppa, which was one of Godfrey's first conquests.

[3] See preceding note.

Ramla, having compelled me to leave them that I may encourage you and the rest of our brethren to follow their example. The enemy has pursued me boldly, and I think will determine on following me here. Now, if you please, we will despatch a messenger to Jerusalem, with my commands to the patriarch and all our brothers to succour us in this extremity in such fitting manner as I shall instruct them." This proposal meeting with general approbation, the king summoned a squire of distinguished intrepidity and said to him: "Dear brother, go to Jerusalem, and bring us a strong party of our brothers in arms, and if you escape with your life I will dub you a knight on your return." The squire executed his commission with perfect success, and well earned the honour of knighthood which was promised him.

The accursed army of pagans laid Ramla in ruins, putting to the sword, or making captives, all whom they found in the place. Then, elated with victory, they marched the same day to Joppa, covering the face of the earth like locusts, having sent Count Stephen and others they reckoned the noblest of the prisoners to Ascalon. The infidels silently beset Joppa for two days, but the third they retired with loss and disgrace. For the sentinels on the watch-tower at Joppa descried the standards of the army of Jerusalem crossing the mountains, and announced it with congratulations to the king, who was near at hand in the castle of the Burgundians. Then the king assembled the band of the faithful and cheered them by this encouraging address: "Now is the wished-for opportunity of brave aspirants to honour, and renowned knights ready to avenge those who are dear to them, but it fills with dismay the cowards and sluggards, and those who are crafty as foxes. You see before your gates that accursed race which is hateful to God and all Christian men. Arm yourselves, then, ye brave, and go forth gloriously to attack the enemies of all goodness. Let us put on our armour that we may take vengeance in the name of God, and sally out to meet our friends who are marching to our aid, and strong in the faith give the enemy battle under God's protection. Reflect in your inmost souls on the wrongs and losses you have sustained, and let the aliens feel the weight of your arms in full vigour. They

have put to the sword Count Stephen, Harpin, and other noble barons, and have carried off our gallant knights and officers; barons, I say with sorrow, than whom braver are not to be found in the world. Let your fresh grief at the loss of your friends inflame your rage and sharpen your swords for the destruction of the enemy. Think of David, that most valiant of kings, and his soldiers, of Joab and Abishai, of Banaiah and Uriah the Ethite, of Jonathan and Judas Maccabæus, and other famous warriors of your own nation. Marching out of the town, we will commence the action, and the Jerusalem troops who are hastening to our support, will fall on the aliens[1] in another quarter. May the mighty Emanuel, the blessed virgin's son, your king and leader, the invincible defender of his church, be with you."[2]

Meanwhile, as the Jerusalemites drew near the castle of Ernald, their standards became visible to the Turkish army. Then King Baldwin and the troops of Joppa adored the holy crucifix, and carrying it in their ranks, sallied forth in full armour, and began to deal terrible blows on the unarmed Turks. The aliens, who were taken by surprise and in disarray, seeing themselves attacked on all sides, and inspired with terror by God himself, betook themselves to flight, as did also the troops of Holofernes in the like extremity. King Baldwin, with the Christians, pursued the gentiles as far as Ascalon, and falling on their rear with great slaughter, recovered all the captives who were threatened with bondage. But the most eminent, having been sent forward to Ascalon, disappeared, nor could any certain intelligence be obtained respecting any of them, except Harpin. Thus the Christians triumphed in Christ's name, after their deep tribulations, and returned, with the vast spoils of the infidels to Jerusalem, giving glad thanks to their triumphant God. They now restored Ramla to a better state than before, and re-established there an episcopal see with fitting revenues. I cannot commit to writing the number of the slain, as I was not present. Those who were in the battle thought more of slaying than counting their enemies, and were afterwards intent on stripping the dead.[2]

[1] *Allophilos.* See the note in p. 178 of the present volume.

[2] This narrative contains several inexact statements and anachronisms.

CH. XXII. *The emperor Alexius delivers Harpin of Bourges from captivity at Babylon—Harpin returns to France and becomes a monk of Cluni.*

HARPIN of Bourges was carried captive to Babylon, and imprisoned for a long time in the emir's dungeons. Mindful of the martyrs who had endured all kinds of tortures, even to death, for the cause of Christ, he frequently called on his name, and receiving consolation, regained his liberty and returned hearty thanks to his Saviour. He obtained his release in the following manner. Some Byzantine merchants had come to Babylon with commodities of various kinds, and according to the law of nations, having paid to the government officers the accustomed duties, abode there for some time. They being Christians, and very affluent, frequented the Christian churches, went among the poor in their own dwellings, and visited the Christians in prison. Harpin conversed with them, and charging them with his commission, sent the following message to the emperor Alexius: "Harpin of Bourges, your servant, who has long groaned in the depth of misery in a Babylonian dungeon, humbly supplicates the magnificence of your imperial majesty to pity and relieve him, by interfering with the emir for his release from prison."

On receiving this message, the emperor felt compassion for the noble Frenchman, and immediately insisted on the emir's sending Hirpin to him, threatening in case of refusal to arrest all the Babylonian merchants and tributaries through the empire of Constantinople. The emir, terrified at this indignant command, immediately freed Harpin from his chains, and, entertaining him for several days in his palace, showed him some rare objects, and then sent him to the emperor, honoured by valuable ornaments and other gifts. Having thus obtained his freedom, he went to the

For instance, it was not in Ramla that Harpin was made prisoner, but in the battle fought in that neighbourhood. Stephen of Blois was killed in the same battle, not carried into captivity. The infidels did not undertake the siege of Joppa the same day they took Ramla. They were only preparing for it when Baldwin gained a signal victory in the beginning of July. Our author's history of these events is well founded, but the details require correction.

emperor's court to thank him for his effectual aid; and, having been loaded with presents, returned to France.

On the way he presented himself to Pope Paschal, and after relating to him his misfortunes and sufferings, consulted him in deep anxiety as to his future course of life. The skilful pontiff, having listened to the knight's account of all he had endured, said: "Especial care should be taken lest any one who has been washed and purified in the bath, and then clothed in garments white as snow or delicate as silk, should walk in the darkness of night through foul roads, lest he stumble in the mire, and, being soiled with filth, should have to blush before all observers. In this mirror, my son, behold yourself, and apply this example for your own correction. You have been cleansed by penance and confession; your laborious pilgrimage and the sufferings of martyrdom have crowned you with the distinctions of virtue; you have made satisfaction to God for your sins by the torments of your prison; and, during your passion, you learned patience, chastity, and other Christian graces. The foul road is a worldly life, which you should resolutely endeavour to avoid, lest you become polluted, and lose the crown of the sufferings in which you glory. Take care, then, not to be as the dog returning to his vomit, and the sow that wallows in the mire. Never again bear arms against Christians, but despise worldly pride like one of the true poor in Christ. Thus, following the steps of Christ in works of righteousness, and relinquishing your own will for the hope of an eternal reward, you will obtain the blessed prize of your heavenly calling with the faithful in Abraham's bosom."

Harpin, having received the pope's benediction, with his leave proceeded to France, where he was received by his friends with great honour; but he did not long remain with them; for, following the counsels of the pope, or rather the precepts of Christ himself, he gave up the world, and, retiring to Cluni, became a monk in that abbey, where he persevered in the service of God until his death." [1]

[1] Our author's account of the deliverance of Harpin and his retirement to Cluni, perfectly agrees with the existing facts of the history of that individual. We have already stated that he made his profession at Cluni in 1109.

CH. XXIII. *Bohemond and other crusaders carried into captivity at Babylon—Romantic account of their deliverance.*

ABOUT this period, other serious disasters befell the crusaders in Syria. The illustrious duke, Mark Bohemond, having undertaken an expedition against the Turks, Daliman[1] attacked him by surprise with a vast multitude, and, putting great numbers of the Christians to the sword, made prisoners of Bohemond and Robert de Principatu,[2] with some other noble and gallant knights, whom he threw into a dungeon, and kept in chains for a long time.[3] Tancred, the commander of Bohemond's troops, was much distressed when he learned the calamity of his lord and kinsman; but he did not give way to a woman's weakness and content himself with vain regrets and lamentations. Assembling the whole force of the faithful from all the surrounding district, and placing vigilant garrisons in the villages and towns in the neighbourhood, he defended his borders against all the enemy's attacks while Bohemond was in captivity, and even nobly enlarged them.

The emperor Alexius was filled with joy when he heard that Bohemond had fallen into the hands of the Turks, and sent envoys with rich presents to Daliman, entreating him to accept an enormous ransom for Bohemond, and to send him to Constantinople on payment of a hundred thousand philips.[4] This he did, not with the intention of giving the duke his liberty, and allowing him the freedom to become again the defender of Christianity, but to subject him to perpetual imprisonment in his own dungeons; for he was deeply vexed that he had taken Antioch from him. It is

[1] The name should be written Danismand.

[2] A province in the kingdom of Naples, now divided into two, of which Salerno and Avellino are the chief towns.

[3] Bohemond and his cousin, Richard de Principatu, were on their way to relieve the Christian city of Melitene, now called Malathia, when they fell into the hands of the Turcoman emir, Danismand. They were kept in captivity four years, and there is no authentic account of the manner of their escaping from it, for the romantic legend preserved by our author cannot be considered as history.

[4] This term is used before in p. 295. The philip was a gold coin bearing originally the effigy of Philip, king of Macedonia. There were also silver and even copper coins bearing the same name.

certain that Antioch is the metropolis[1] of the Constantinopolitan empire, but the Turks had wrested it from the emperor by force of arms fourteen years before the Cisalpines reduced the city when Cassian was slain. That prince never abandoned his claims on it, but, in consequence of the resistance offered by the obstinate valour of the Normans, he was never able to accomplish his wishes. He made the attempt at different times and in various ways, using both entreaties and money, with the pagans as well as the Christians, but in vain; for, foiled in all his endeavours, the city remained in the hands of the victors, those, I mean, who acquired it by their eminent valour in conquering the Agarenes, and having obtained it, defended it admirably by the help of God. However, Daliman rejected the emperor's overtures, and resolved to inflict perpetual captivity on Bohemond, who was called by the Turks, "The little God of the Christians." That which conferred so much honour on his own faith he counted as beyond all price.

In the time of the Turks, a certain Greek was patriarch of Antioch. The Norman conquerors found him intractable.[2] Having become masters, they resolved that the clergy and people should conform to the Latin rites, but the Greeks, adhering to their ancient usages, presumed to think this unreasonable. When Bohemond was made prisoner, a rumour was spread among the people that the bishop was contriving means for betraying the city of Antioch to the emperor. But when he learned that such reports were current against him, he was highly incensed, and, whether indignant from a clear conscience, or instigated by apprehensions of being charged with so foul a transaction, I know not, he left his bishopric, and retired into the wilderness, determined never to return among a people whose usages he detested. The Normans, being then masters of the city,

[1] Our author probably means to say, one of the metropolitan cities.—*Le Prevost.* Might not however Antioch have been considered by the author the ecclesiastical metropolis of the east, as having been the seat of St. Peter?

[2] This paragraph is inexact. John IV., the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, was naturally unwilling to conform to the usages of the Latin church, and, consequently, not being able to maintain a good understanding with the Franks when they became masters of Antioch, he retired to Constantinople two months afterwards.

rejoiced at the Greek's abdication, and communicated to Bohemond in his prison the whole circumstances, asking his advice about the appointment of a successor to the patriarch. His commands were that Bernard of Provence,[1] who had been chaplain to Adhemar, bishop of Puy, and was recommended by him as his intimate friend to Bohemond, another particular friend, should be translated from the see of Maschenia and raised to the patriarchate of Antioch. By the duke's order, therefore, the clergy and people elected Bernard, and seated their bishop in the chair of St. Peter the apostle. He was a man of learning, but when he became known to his flock, was much disliked, for he was both covetous, and, according to the character of the Goths from whom he descended,[2] very austere. He ruled the church of God for a long period, retaining the government of his see to the age of decrepitude. In his time, as already stated and will be more fully related hereafter, the Christians in the East suffered violent disasters.

It was published throughout the world that Bohemond was in captivity among the pagans. All Christendom mourned for him, and even the pagans themselves paid him honours in his prison. The whole church offered prayers to God on his behalf, that he would deliver the captive from the hands of his enemies. But the merciful God, who created all things, while he knows how to chastise his servants with afflictions on account of their sins, is ready also to afford marvellous succour to those who humbly implore him. Abraham and Joseph experienced this under Pharaoh, among the Egyptians; Tobias and Raguel under Salmonassar, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon, among the Assyrians; Daniel and the three children, with the other sons of the transmigration, under Nebuchadnosor and Evilmerodach, among the Chaldeans; Esdras, and Nehemiah, and Mordecai, with his niece Esther, under Cyrus, Darius, and

[1] Bernard, chaplain of the bishop of Puy, was not a Provençal, but a native of Valence in Dauphiny. It was two years after the retirement of John IV. that he was summoned from his bishopric of Arthasium to succeed him as Latin patriarch of Antioch. He held that dignity until his death in 1135.

[2] Our author makes Bernard a Goth, from having confounded Valence in Dauphiny with Valence in Spain, and forgets that he has just described him as a Provençal.

Artaxerxes, among the Persians and Medes. This also was happily felt by the apostles and other holy preachers, who frequently, on their first arrival in barbarous countries, were despised as aliens and mendicants, but soon afterwrads the splendour of their miracles and their words of thunder struck the natives with awe, and brought under the yoke of the divine law those who before were opposed to all that is good. Thus He who said, "My Father works hitherto, and I work,"[1] recently visited in their prison his champions, of whom I speak in my writings for the information of posterity, and from admiration of the divine operations; cheering them plenteously with the mellifluous nectar of his loving-kindness. Mortals have the scourge of sufferings inflicted on them for the sins of human infirmity, and are compelled, when punished by the divine rod, to implore in sorrow the mercy of their Maker. God, our King, who saves those who trust in him, listened with power to the prayers of his church, and succoured the captive duke and his companions by the address and assistance of his enemy's daughter; as formerly he aided his suffering people by means of Judith, the courageous widow, when she cut off the head of the proud Holophernes at Bethulia.

Melaz,[2] the daughter of Daliman, was a beautiful and accomplished princess, and possessed great power in all her father's house, having the command of abundant wealth and a number of slaves to do her will. Hearing of the bravery of the Franks, she conceived a high regard for them, and sought their intimacy so ardently, that, bribing the gaolers liberally, she frequently descended into their dungeons, and held acute discussions with the prisoners concerning the

[1] John v. 17.

[2] It has been observed in a former note that we have no historical record of the mode in which Bohemond and his companions in captivity obtained their release, or effected their escape, after four years' imprisonment. Our author undertakes to give an account of it in the concluding pages of the present book. No one can for a moment attach the character of authenticity to the details of his narrative. As M. Guizot remarks in his introduction to the present work, Ordericus made collections from all quarters of traditions and adventures as well as facts, and we are not disposed to complain that among the stores of information gathered by his industry, he has left us a very interesting specimen of the romance of the middle ages.

Christian faith and the true religion, sometimes mingling deep sighs with the investigations she made. Their gentle and kind deportment placed them higher in her affections than even her parents, and she took care to supply them with all that was needful for food and clothing. Meanwhile, her father, occupied by a multiplicity of other affairs, was either unconscious of what was going on, or, placing implicit confidence in the conduct of his beloved daughter, did not trouble himself about it.

At the end of two years, a worse than civil war commenced between Daliman and his brother. Soliman, instigated by his fierce and ambitious temper, took arms against Daliman, and, assembling large bodies of troops, made an irruption into his brother's territories, and had the insolence to provoke him to battle. Daliman's indignation was roused by so unnatural an hostility; and, having obtained succour from all quarters, and being proud of his former victories, he was eager for the bloody conflict, and, as the day of battle drew near, pitched his camp ready for action.

Meanwhile Melaz sought a private conference with the Christians, in which she thus addressed them: "I have long heard the chivalry of the Franks celebrated, and now I wish to prove it in the hour of my father's deepest need, that experience may prove to the eyes what the ears have heard by report." Bohemond replied: "Sweet and honourable lady, if it be your highness's pleasure that we should have permission to appear on the field of battle with our knightly arms, no doubt we shall show with sword and lance the force of such blows as Franks deal, and make trial of them on your enemies before your eyes." The young princess then said: "Promise me, on your faith as Christians, that in the affair of which we treat, you will act in all things by my advice, and not venture to take any step contrary to my orders. Satisfy me of this by pledging your faith, and then I will not hesitate to open to you the secrets of my heart."

Bohemond first gave the solemn engagement required, and all the others followed his example, promising all the princess enjoined. She then said, radiant with joy: "Now I have full confidence in you, because I believe you are true to your word, and will never violate your promise in

any manner. Succour my father, who is now on the field, where he is on the point of engaging in battle, and hasten to lend him the aid of your valour. If success attend you, as I trust it will, do not delay in pursuit of the fleeing enemy, but hasten back here with your arms, and do not disarm till I give you orders. Meanwhile, I will cause all the guards to descend from the highest floor of the tower to the lower gates, and to remain with me in the court as if they were waiting for you. When you return, and you hear me command them to bind you in in the fetters you wear, lay hands upon them stoutly, and without a moment's loss, seize them all and thrust them into the dungeon in your place. For myself, at this sight, I shall flee from you as if you were savage wolves. As to you, take possession of the strongest tower, and hold it vigilantly until you have made suitable terms with my father. There are doors high up in the tower, through which you can come down into the palace by stone steps, and get possession of the whole wealth and all the apartments of my father. To make an end, should my parent be incensed against me for these my offences, I beseech you, O friends, whom I love as my own soul, hasten, without loss of time, to my aid."

Having said this, she armed the knights, and immediately led them forth. She had already corrupted and deceived the guards, and on giving them their instructions, spoke to them in the following manner: "I am overwhelmed with fears for my father, seeing that he is about to engage in battle with a host from many nations. He is so intrepid a warrior that he will not condescend to demand assistance from his captives. But I would have you know that he has left it to my care and in my power to supply the Christians with arms and send them to the fight in aid of our troops. If, by their means the enemy is overcome, the honour and profit will belong to us, but if they fall pierced by hostile weapons we shall have nothing to lament in the loss of aliens, whose usages and ceremonies all the race of the Agarenes abhor."

On hearing this, the guards cheerfully acquiesced in the proposal, and praised to the skies the forethought of their prudent lady. Thereupon she released the captives from their fetters, conducted them from their house of bondage, and having armed them, dismissed them to the combat.

Finding the armies already sharply engaged, they shouted the war-cry of the Normans, DIEUX AIDE[1] with confidence, and the squadrons of Soliman, hearing their cries and dealing fearful blows, recoiled. There were some Christian soldiers in his army, who, to their great joy, recognized Bohemond, the renowned chief, and deserting Soliman, attached themselves to the Catholics.

Soliman had a son named Marciban, a presumptuous youth, who, hearing that Bohemond was on the field, challenged him to battle by name, being ambitious of meeting him in single combat. At length they met in the presence of Daliman, and attacked each other fiercely; but the Norman warrior brought the Turk to the ground, and drawing his sword, struck off his head. Daliman shouting: "Hold, spare him, he is my nephew," the Christian hero, when he heard that, concealed his inward triumph under a sorrowful countenance, and said ironically: "Pardon me, my lord; I did it in ignorance; I took him for an enemy, instead of your nephew, and sacrificed his life to do your pleasure."

After great slaughter on both sides, the army of Soliman was defeated, and a body of the enemy pursued them the whole of the day. The Christians immediately returned, as it was agreed, and found the princess with the guards waiting for them at the entrance of the tower. On seeing them coming, she said to the gaolers: "It is plain that the Franks are true to their word, and keep the faith they pledge unbroken: go to them as they enter, receive their arms, and take them back to their former prison, until my father, on his arrival, shall confer on them the rewards they merit for their service in the battle." The Turks left their lady to do her bidding, but the Franks closed on them, and making them prisoners, thrust them into the dungeon, and closely barring the doors, seized possession of the whole interior of the tower without making any public disturbance, becoming masters of the place without effusion of blood. Indeed, the city was left defenceless, as all the men had gone out to the battle; and only the women and children remained trembling to keep the houses. There was a vaulted chamber in the principal tower in which a large

[1] DIEX AYE, "God be our help," the war-cry of the Normans, which Bohemond preserved as well as the red ensign of his Scandinavian ancestors.

treasure, with valuable effects and much wealth, was preserved, and the palace of the king was connected with the tower.

The night following, Melaz introduced the Christians into the palace by the entrance from the tower, showing them all the chambers and secret recesses, and instructing them what they were to do on Daliman's arrival. Returning the next day, with his satraps, and captains, and great men, his daughter met him, accompanied by her young companions, with lively joy: "Welcome," she said, "O glorious conqueror." But the king replied: "Hold your peace, abandoned girl; I care not for your perfidious congratulations. I despise your deceitful flatteries. By the sacred turban of Mahomet, who has given me the victory, you and your champions shall die to-morrow; you, who have put arms into the hands of my adversaries to my utter confusion shall be burnt in the flames with them as a most abominable traitress." The king had not yet learnt that the guards of his citadel were fettered in its dark dungeon, nor that the Franks, exulting in freedom, had possession of the upper floor, and with Christ's aid were preparing to attack him. The young princess fled, trembling and pale, from his fury, and sought the concealment of her chamber in grief and alarm.

Some hours afterwards the incensed prince seated himself on his tribunal, having no one with him but his principal nobles, the rest of his people, with his squires and guards being dispersed at their several lodgings and occupied about their horses, arms, and other equipments. Having commanded some of the attendants to go to the private apartments, and bring before him the presumptuous traitress, in obedience to the summons she stood alone before the exasperated tyrant, and heard his terrible threats and reproaches without any to help her. Meanwhile, Bohemond, looking through a window in the tower which commanded the interior of the palace, and observing his deliverer standing in her desolation before the seat of judgment, exclaimed in deep distress: "Lo, our protrectress is in extreme peril; it is time that we should issue forth and aid her with our utmost efforts." No time was lost in descending by the staircase, step by step, into the palace, and Daliman with

his officers and courtiers found themselves suddenly surrounded by the armed Franks, who securely closed the doors of the building, and took possession of all the defences round it. All parties were in a state of extreme anxiety, not knowing what it was best to do. As for the Turks, they had no means of escape, as the doors were securely closed; they could not hide themselves as they were surrounded by men with drawn swords; unarmed and few, they were unable to resist a number of valiant men well supplied with arms. It was in the power of the Christians at that moment to massacre all the Gentiles, but they did not dare to lift a hand against any one or do him any injury without the young princess's orders, in consequence of the oath they had given her. They, therefore, all looked to her, waiting her commands as they avoided forfeiting their pledge.

At last Melaz, begining to find herself in security, said to her father, laughing: "My dear father, your anger against me is unjust; you frighten me with terrible threats, and overwhelm me with reproaches for the timely succour which, in my great regard, I adroitly provided for you in your hour of need; for the Franks having taking arms, joined you in the battle, your side was strengthened and your enemies were sooner routed. Consider how honourably these Christians have acted. They loyally supported you in the battle, and the enemy gave way before their attacks. They had abundant opportunities of making their escape, as even the purblind can see, but, being unwilling to depart without taking leave they voluntarily returned here, and confidently expect from your liberality the rewards they have earned by their courage in the field. At this instant their hands are on their sword-hilts, and if they chose they would massacre all of us in a moment. They are masters of the citadel and the palace, and all your treasures contained in them are at their mercy; your guards are in fetters and dare not mutter a word against them. In these circumstances, my father, consider what you have to do, and consult the councillors I see about you."

Having said this, the princess placed herself at the head of the Christians. Meanwhile, Daliman drew aside and took the opinion of his friends. He then resumed his seat and said, "We wish first, daughter, to hear what you propose." Her

reply was this: "I shall not hesitate to suggest what I think is the best course; make peace with the Christians, and preserve it inviolably as long as you live. Release all the captives of that religion throughout your dominions, and let them in turn liberate all your subjects who are in their power. Confer on Bohemond and his comrades, by whose aid you have gained a glorious victory, the rewards they merit for their distinguished service. For myself, know that I am become a Christian, and desire to receive the sacrament of regeneration according to the Christian rites, nor shall I longer abide with you. The faith of the Christians is holy and pure, while yours is full of vanity, and polluted with all uncleanness."

This language greatly irritated the Turks, who exhibited their anger by stern glances and menacing gestures, but were divinely withheld from giving vent to the malice of their impious minds by acts of violence. While they were consulting together on what was to be done, Melaz calling the Christians apart, thus addressed them: "Courage, brave knights, proved in many difficulties and trials! You who have come voluntarily from distant countries, and by your persevering valour have escaped such perils, act firmly in the name of your God whom you call Almighty. Now is the time to shew your courage and use your arms, that what you have begun boldly you may carry into effect in a manner worthy of yourselves. My father is greatly incensed against us, and is contriving with his friends, to the utmost of his power, the means for our destruction. Thus far you have strictly observed the conditions I required. I now release you from the promise to which you solemnly pledged your faith. It is time for you to man the citadel and the palace with the wall round it, and all the chambers, both great and small, and to keep a careful watch and guard the avenues that no one shall go out or in without your knowledge. If my father finds means of escaping from the palace, he will raise *en masse* all the people round, and will compel you by a cruel siege to a base surrender or take your lives. Shut him up then, with all his adherents, in one apartment, and use all necessary force to compel them, when there, to come to terms, but as far as possible avoid the effusion of blood. I commit the superintendence and command in this affair to

you, my lord Bohemond, who have so much experience, and whose wisdom and mature judgment are renowned throughout the world. From this time, I shall be inseparably your sister, and will share cheerfully your success or misfortunes, in the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ."

In consequence Bohemond, with great pleasure, forcibly thrust Daliman and all his party into one of the chambers and placed armed guards over it. He then posted the other knights at various points, giving orders to each how they were to act, and thus he held possession of the prince's palace, with all he found in it, for nearly fifteen days. He permitted the wives of the emir and his nobles, with their attendants and unarmed eunuchs, to have access to them and to supply them with food and all other necessaries. Meanwhile Daliman bitterly lamented that his own house was made his prison, and his daughter the gaoler, at whose instance he was strictly confined. He did not spare curses on his god Mahomet, and on all his friends, subjects, and neighbours who suffered him to submit to such rough treatment in the seat of his power from a small band of captives and aliens. The nobles who were incarcerated with him persuaded him to come to terms with the Christians, that at least they might escape with their lives. At last his fears got the better of his obstinacy. Having conferred with Bohemond, he implored his amity, and consented that he and all his companions should go free, and thus all the captives who groaned n his dungeons should have their liberty; he also promised to give him his daughter in marriage.

Bohemond having informed Melaz of what had passed, the able princess replied: "Words are easily uttered, but must not always be taken on trust. Listen civilly to my father's smooth speeches, but receive them with caution. Keep watchful guard over what is in your hands until you can ensure your success in complete security. Let trusty messengers be despatched by different roads to Antioch to summon an armed force of your countrymen, who will form an honourable escort, and conducting you without hazard of treachery into your own states, place you out of the reach of the perfidious wiles of all the malevolent." This advice was approved by all the Christians, and in consequence Richard de Principatu and Sarcis were sent from

Mesopotamia to Antioch, and made known the state of affairs to the people there, who received the intelligence with delight. Then Tancred, Bohemond's governor, sent commissioners to collect all the knights and other Gentiles who were in captivity, and as soon as they were assembled, delivered them to Richard and Sarcis to be conducted to Babylon. Amongst others liberated at this time was the daughter of Cassian, the [former] emir of Antioch, who made great lamentations when she was released from her confinement among the Christians. Being asked the cause of her sorrow, the lady replied, that she grieved because she would no longer partake of that excellent food, pork-meat, which the Christians ate. For the Turks and many other Saracen nations abhor the flesh of swine, while they eagerly devour that of dogs and wolves. Thus it is proved that they submit neither to the law of Moses, or that of Christ, and belong neither to Jews, or Christians.[1]"

Meanwhile Bohemond had frequent conferences with Daliman, and by his ability and moderation established terms of familiar intimacy with him, taking opportunities of favourably disposing him towards numbers who were placed under his tyrannical power. His respectful and courteous language soothed the resentment of the emir and his companions in captivity, and he even gained their regards by the care with which he paid them deferential attention. By degrees the provincial governors and other chiefs became acquainted with their new ruler, and feeling extreme anxiety to scrutinize the man who had become the master of their lawful sovereign, and having, by his permission, access to their prince, highly celebrated Bohemond's merits. They urged Daliman, as their legitimate sovereign, to act for the good

[1] This amusing episode concerning the princess Baghi-Sian, and her predilection for pork, is of a piece with the rest of the narrative, adding a touch of the comic to its character as a romance. Wherever our author found the story, he seems to have copied it without examination, for it is extraordinary that, with his great display of biblical knowledge, it should have escaped his recollection that the law of Moses is as stringent as he represents the practice of the Mahometans with regard to eating the flesh of swine. (See Levit. xi. 7; Deut. ix. 8.) It is possible, however, that Ordericus may have been but imperfectly acquainted with this portion of the sacred writings, to which much importance was not at that time attached.

of the state, and recommended him to seek the friendship of the illustrious duke by all the means in his power, often quoting the words of the comic poet:—

"If you can't do what you will,
Then wish rather what you can."[1]

Adding this, "In the victory we recently gained, we were signally deceived, for we had the enemies of our own faith as our efficient allies in the defeat of our countrymen, and we stupidly and wickedly gloried in our common loss; our own God, the execrable Mahomet, utterly deserted us, and bowed powerless before the God of the Christians. Behold how wonderfully that crucified Christ, whom they call The Almighty, and justly, as all their enemies find and prove to their loss, inspires your daughter, in a most unlooked-for manner, to break the chains of those you believed to be strictly confined in your dungeons, and had condemned to perpetual prison in the fortress. He had given them a brilliant triumph when they appeared in arms on the field of battle, and their swords are red with the blood of our brothers and nephews. Still more, he has given them possession of your principal stronghold containing all your wealth, and has put you and the great men of your kingdom into their hands, imprisoned in your own palace, as in a sorrowful dungeon, having, as if you were helpless women, made no resistance. We have no means of access to you but by leave of these foreigners, and it is out of our power to render you any help. We cannot unite to attack them, because they would immediately vent their resentment on you. If even the great king, the Soldan of Persia, should march here with the whole of his forces and attempt to assault the citadel, such is the valour of the Franks, and so strong are the fortifications, that they would dare to resist him in the fortress, and would inflict severe chastisement on us before they were reduced. It is better, therefore,

[1] *Quando non potest id fieri quod vis,*
Id velis quid possit.
Ter. Andr. Act ii. *sc.* 1.

It is edifying to find these brave Turks, fit subjects for a comic opera, better acquainted with the classics than Ordericus seems to have been with Leviticus.

amicably to make terms with the enemy, than rashly to rouse his fatal rage."

Daliman yielded to this advice. Accepting the proffered friendship of the illustrious duke, he gave liberal orders in his palace for the common good, and made freely from his treasures large donations to the Christians. He also commanded all the captives throughout his dominions to be set at liberty. They were diligently inquired after, and when found conducted to Daliman, who clothed them well and delivered them to Bohemond. The duke forthwith enlisted these captives in his service among their countrymen, assigning them various duties, that, augmenting his force and his guard, they and their comrades might not be molested through any insidious schemes of the Pagans.

Richard and Sarcis returned in fifteen days, having executed their commission and accompanied by a powerful body of Christians. Daliman ordered them to be received with distinguished honours, and abundantly supplied with provisions, according to the customs of the country, and to be liberally furnished with all that they required. Then Bohemond and Daliman ratified the treaty for a perpetual peace between them, and three days were employed in preparing a suitable equipment of every sort. At length, Bohemond and Richard, with their companions in captivity departed from it exulting, and, like Zorobabel and Nehemiah, blessed the Lord God of Israel. Daliman and his nobles, also joyful because they were released from imprisonment, conducted them for some distance on their journey, but with perfidious intentions, meaning to take some opportunity of doing them mischief; but God protecting his servants, they could not accomplish it. For the faithful were apprehensive of this, and in consequence marched with arms in their hands, and prepared for battle. They also strictly guarded the hostages which had been given for their security, until they reached the appointed place of safety. At last Daliman demanded from his allies in a friendly manner permission to return, and having obtained it, turned his back on them, sorrowful because he had failed of finding means, by any stratagem, of injuring them on the road.

The prudent Melaz, with her attendants and eunuchs and splendid household, quitting her father's house, and voluntа-

rily leaving all her family, piously, attached herself to the Christians at Bithia, as Pharaoh's daughter[1] happily accompanied Moses and the Hebrews when they went out of Egypt. The citizens of Antioch came in triumphant procession to meet their chiefs whose loss they had long deplored, and the clergy with all the people offered devout praises to the Lord God of Sabaoth, who saves all that trust in him. Bohemond despatched Richard [de Principatu], the companion of his captivity, to France, sending by him silver fetters to the shrine of St. Leonard, with devout thanksgivings for his liberation.[2]

The illustrious Melaz having been regenerated and admitted into the Christian church by the holy sacrament of baptism, Bohemond took an opportunity of thus addressing her in the assembly of the chiefs: "Noble virgin, who while you were yet a pagan unexpectedly succoured us in a wonderful way, and have wisely left your kindred for the sake of the Lord Jesus, whom you kindly entreated in us who are his members and servants, for which you incurred your father's anger to the peril of your life, select from amongst us a husband to your choice, in the name of Christ; for it is not right that we should in the slightest degree oppose your reasonable wishes, debtors as we deeply are to your past deservings. First, however listen to my advice, which I trust, my sweet friend, will be serviceable to you: I admit that your father betrothed you to myself, but I hope to provide better for you, and I will tell you plainly for what reason. From my youth upwards I have never enjoyed rest, and spending my life in toil, have suffered grievously, and I fear that worse evils are still in store for me, for I have to contend against the emperor, as well as the pagans by whom I am surrounded. Besides, while I was in prison, I made a vow to undertake a pilgrimage to St. Leonard's in Aquitaine. I offer you these apologies from sincere affection, because I should regret, more than if you were my

[1] We know not where Ordericus got the name of this supposititious daughter of Pharaoh, but we may at least affirm that it is not to be found in the bible.

[2] We shall presently find Bohemond himself, in 1106, going to return thanks to St. Leonard at his church in the Limousin, again with more detail.

daughter or sister, to see you suffer any affliction, or form a connection of which you might soon repent. What joy or delight could our union afford you, when immediately after our marriage I must undertake a long journey by sea and land, and go into a far distant country near the ends of the earth? Considering all this, lady, choose for yourself a better lot from among many who would be your suitors. Here is Roger, son of prince Richard, my cousin, he is young and handsome, far different from me, and he is my equal in birth, wealth, and power; I commend him, that you may be induced to accept him for your husband, and I trust that you will live many years together."

All present seconded the duke's prudent counsel, and the wise princess readily yielded to the unanimous opinion of so many eminent men. In consequence, Roger's happy nuptials with Melaz were celebrated with great honours, and to the universal joy of the people of Antioch. Bohemond himself served as steward of the feast, with the principal lords of the country. Six years afterwards, on the death of Bohemond and Tancred, Roger succeeded to the principality of Antioch, but in the course of two years from his accession he was slain on the field of Sarmatan, with seven thousand Christiâns by Amirgazis the Persian.[1]

I have now given a long account of the revolutions in human affairs and the fortunes of mankind; but, if life be spared me, there is still much to be related in succeeding pages. I close here the . . . .[2] book of this Ecclesiastical History, and, fatigued with my labour, now require some short respite from it.[3]

[1] Roger, son of Richard de Principatu, succeeded Tancred in his government of Laodicea and Apamia, and the guardianship of the young prince of Antioch, in the month of December, 1112. He fell in a battle in which he had imprudently engaged with the Moslems in 1119. Their chief's name, here metamorphosed into Amir-Gazis, was Ylgazy, or Al-Gazi, son of Ortok, sultan of Maridin and Aleppo. The return of Bohemond to Antioch from his captivity, by whatever means it was effected, took place in 1104.

[2] There is a blank in the manuscript, which was evidently intended to be filled up with the number of the present book, compatibly, perhaps, with the new arrangement contemplated on the addition of additional books to the earlier portion of the history.

[3] The original text of the last paragraph is an hexameter verse:

Et mihi jam fesso requies aliquantula detur.

BOOK XI.

PREFACE.

O MERCIFUL God of Sabaoth, mighty King, who governest all things, and reignest through all ages, vouchsafe to be the Saviour of the work of thy hands! Restrain the violence of Satan, who continually vents his rage against thee by seeking everywhere to vex thy servants. Listen, I beseech thee, to my prayers, O gracious Creator of the world! I adore thee, I seek thee, I labour, as I ought, to do thy will. I, an old man, now record the acts of popes and kings; and, a sexagenarian, make them clear to the young. But I do it gratuitously, careful only for the approbation of my brethren. If new miracles were openly wrought in these days, I would endeavour to give a faithful report of them in my annals. I think that a summary of them would be more acceptable both to the present generation and posterity, would more profit myself, and please others, than to examine and describe at large worldly wants and transitory honours. I aim at glorious things, and would write of miracles, filling my pages with prodigies in Christ's name. My delight is to offer praise to Him who governs the whole world, and who can easily cure us of all our ills. But I am compelled to speak of the evil we see or suffer, and to record the unstable acts of mortals; for love of the world drags crowds of men to the bottomless pit, nor can the file of justice polish off the rust of crime. Inclined to evil, they dwell on the earthly and despise the heavenly, being so bent on the earth that they cannot behold the other. Sinners carry their fatal burdens, and the splendid miracles of the saints naturally cease. Transgressors of the law merit the punishment of the divine wrath, instead of miracles. We might enlarge on the suits and hostilities which the fierce desire of gain occasions in the world. If learned men could condescend to dwell on infamous subjects, they might descant on murder, incest, and a thousand crimes. The fool perplexes himself to no purpose and wastes his time, while no wise man permits his to be ill-spent. He, indeed, wastes his time who writes

useless verses, and that labour is lost from which no profit is gained. The elect devote themselves to goodness with ardent zeal, and apply diligently to laudable studies. There is no need of using compulsion to those who voluntarily take up their burdens, collecting the sheaves of corn and carrying them to the garner. There is no need of the spur for a horse that goes freely; a gentle rein only is wanting to prevent him from stumbling; but the rider uses sharp spurs to a dull horse, and applies frequent strokes of the whip to quicken his pace. Such is the law of the church with gentle teachers; they urge the indolent to action by admonitions, while they restrain the froward.

The evil beast with ten horns already triumphs; and the fierce populations are everywhere polluted with the leprosy of sin. The Lord showed the Behemoth in an allegory to his friend Job; and this insidious demon rages in a perverse world. Erynnis pursues her furious course over the earth, and daily plunges her victims into the depths of hell. Amphisilena makes sport of and deludes mankind, and by her wiles deprives them of the joys of paradise. Alas! the foul serpent infects them with his deadly poison, so that they lose their reason and engage in mutual slaughter. The foolish bring on themselves diseases and pestilences, and the perverse add sin to sin. We observe the misfortunes of men, and the miserable disasters with which a skilful writer can fill his sheets of parchment; if he wants to use empty words on various subjects, he will find abundant materials in the calamities of the world.

The malicious enemy of the human race is described by various names in the Scriptures inspired by Heaven. He is called a lion, wolf, dragon, partridge,[1] basilisk, a kite, a boar, a fox, a dog, a bear, a leach, a satyr; and he becomes a deadly serpent when he deludes us with his wiles, and compasses by force or fraud the destruction of fools. A thousand other names will occur to the intelligent reader, derived from the various artifices to which the enemy of mankind resorts. He corrupts countless numbers with sin,

[1] One wonders to see the timid partridge figure in his list of savage animals. Perhaps some magical virtues may have been attributed to it. Otherwise we might venture to propose *pardus*, or *pardalis*, the panther, for *perdrix*, the reading of the text.

and often brings them to destruction. Alas! they often perish in vast bodies.

Merciful Jesus, our holy King and great High Priest, save us from being infected like the reprobate with the poison of the old serpent; and raise us purified from our sins above the storms of the world, and graciously admit us into the company of the saints in thy courts above! Amen.

CH. I. *King Henry punishes the barons who had revolted.*

IN the year of our Lord 1102, the ninth indiction, Henry, king of England, having concluded a peace with his brother, and being firmly established on the throne, began gradually to reek his vengeance on the traitors who had infamously deserted him in the time of need. Robert Malet,[1] Ivo de Grantmesnil, Robert of Pontefract, son of Ilbert de Laci, and Robert de Belèsme, the most powerful of these barons, with many others, were brought to trial, not all at once, but separately and at different times, charged with various treasonable acts. Some of them, not being able to clear themselves of the crimes alleged against them, were heavily fined, while others, who were greater objects of suspicion to the king, were utterly disinherited by him and driven into exile.

CH. II. *King Henry's harsh conduct to his brother Robert and the nobles who had joined the duke in the league against him—Henry's prosperity and character.*

THE year following William de Warrenne presented himself in great distress to Robert, duke of Normandy, and represented to him the severe loss he had sustained in his service, having forfeited his earldom of Surrey, which produced him the yearly revenue of a thousand pounds of silver; claiming in consequence Robert's good offices to reconcile him with the king, his brother, and procure his restoration to his former honours. The duke readily assented to his

[1] Robert de Malet is mentioned in the succeeding chapter. For the rest of these persons, see the notes to b. x.

request, and crossed over to England. The king was in great wrath when he heard of his coming, and said to his courtiers and counsellors: "What should I do to my enemies who presume to intrude upon me, and trespass on the borders of my kingdom without my licence?" Various replies were made, but the king sent some of his own guard to meet the duke and plainly tell him his mind. The ill-advised duke then discovered by private communications that he had rashly ventured within the bounds of England, and, unless he followed prudent counsels, he would never escape from the island in which he was, as it were, enclosed, and return when he pleased to his own dominions. However, the politic king gave orders that the duke should be honourably conducted to court with his retinue; and their deep counsels were kept private, lest strangers should detect any appearance of ill-will betwen the brothers. The duke, though much terrified, concealed his alarm under an assumed gaiety, and the king, on his part, dissembled the fury that raged in his bosom under a smiling countenance. Among other things[1] the king accused the duke of having violated the treaty, by not punishing public traitors, nor proceeding with princely rigour against rebels, and that he had given a gracious reception in Normandy that same year to Robert de Belèsme, restoring to him his patrimonial domains, the castle of Argentan, the bishopric of Séez, and the forest of Gouffern. That butcher having sailed over to Normandy had obtained the county of Ponthieu in right of William Talvas, in consequence of the death of Guy, count of Abbeville, his father-in-law.[2] The duke, alarmed at these reproaches, promised submissively to remedy all the grievances. He was also induced by the queen's influence to forego the annual pension of three thousand pounds, which had been agreed on. In consequence, the king restored him to favour, renewed the late treaty, and reinstated William de Warrenne in the earldom of Surrey. The earl, having thus recovered his father's inheritance, which he had foolishly forfeited, learned wisdom

[1] It was probably in this conversation that the king told his brother, *ut comitem, non monachum ageret*, to conduct himself like an earl, instead of behaving like a monk.

[2] Guy I., count of Ponthieu, father-in-law of William Talvas.

from his misfortunes, and afterwards adhered faithfully to the king during thirty-three years they lived together, ranking among the chief of his intimate friends.

Duke Robert now returned to Normandy, an object of greater contempt to his subjects than he was before, having gained nothing by his expedition but fear, trouble, and disgrace. The king, prospering in all his affairs, found his power greatly augmented, and report spreading his fame far and wide, he was considered one of the greatest princes in the four quarters of the globe. No king of England had been more powerful, nor possessed wider territories within the island, nor was more favoured by fortune in the acquisition of all that mortals need in the fullest abundance.[1] If life be spared me, the sequel of my history will, by God's aid, clearly exhibit this. He reduced all his enemies to subjec-

[1] "Our author prides himself in regarding Henry I. as one of the most powerful, rich, and successful kings who ever wore the crown of England. As to the happiness resulting from a quiet conscience and peace of mind, things still more desirable, it is our duty to remark, that the case was very different, and that this Lewis of the twelfth century painfully expiated, if not by his remorse, by his violent passions and the terrors of his life, all the apparent prosperity which, so to speak, dazzled the eyes of his cotemporaries. We cannot too strongly recommend readers who would desire to form a precise idea of the contrast afforded by Henry's history to consult a little treatise by Henry of Huntingdon, which is very curious and distinguished for its high philosophical views. It is inserted in the second volume of the *Anglia Sacra*, under the title, *De episcopis sui temporis*. In this treatise the prosperities of the English monarch are appreciated at their real worth with great impartiality, but at the same time with lofty views which would do honour to a modern historian of the first rank. We exceedingly regret that the limits to which we are compelled to confine ourselves, will not permit the insertion of this review, the interest of which is increased by its having been published during the life of a prince who was implacable in his resentments against every one who ventured to scrutinize the secrets of his conscience. We must be content with quoting the concluding words which form a striking contrast to the language of Ordericus: 'You will soon witness the wretched end of a miserable life.' The historian's prediction received its accomplishment in the course of the same year." *Note to Ordericus by M. Le Prevost.*

We have been induced to insert a literal translation of our fellow labourer's note, as presenting just views of the character of Henry I., as well as, we are ready to confess, from being flattered at finding our own view of the value of the treatise referred to confirmed from so high a quarter, having been instrumental in rescuing it from obscurity by adding it to Mr. Bohn's Edition of Henry of Huntingdon's History, to which it forms a suitable appendix. See that work, pp. 301—319.

tion either by policy or force, and rewarded those who served him with riches and honours. Many there were of high condition whom he hurled from the summit of power for their presumption, and sentenced to the perpetual forfeiture of their patrimonial estates. On the contrary, there were others of low origin, whom, for their obsequious services, he raised to the rank of nobles, taking them, so to speak, from the dust, surrounding them with wealth, and, exalting them above earls, and distinguished lords of castles. Such men as Geoffrey de Clinton,[1] Ralph Basset,[2] Hugh de Bocheland,[3] Guillegrip, Rainier de Bada,[4] William Troussebot,[5] Haimon de Falaise,[6] Guigan Algaso,[7] Robert de Bostare,

[1] Geoffrey de Clinton is called chamberlain of Henry I. in the charter of foundation of the priory of Kenilworth.

[2] The family of Basset appears in all the lists of distinguished persons at the time of the Conquest. It was probably settled originally at Ouillie-la-Basset, near Falaise. Ralph Basset and his son Richard, both successively great-justiciaries of England, merited, notwithstanding what our author says, the character given them of *clarissimi viri* by Henry of Huntingdon in the work of which we have just spoken, in which he passes so severe a judgment on most of the celebrated persons who were his cotemporaries. Ralph Basset was in 1106, one of the five commissioners employed to decide the controversy between Gerard, archbishop of York, and the abbey of Ripon. He died in 1120. His son, Geoffrey Basset, was, like his father, justiciary of England. The first person known of this family appears to be Osmond Basset, a cotemporary with William the Conqueror, mentioned in the great charter of Montevilliers.

[3] The *Monasticon Anglicanum* shows several charters addressed by Henry I. to Hugh de Bocheland, attesting that this person was one of his principal officers. Of Guillegrip we have no information.

[4] *De Bada*, probably Bath. Of this family Richard de Bada, perhaps the son of Regnier, appears as witness to a charter of King Stephen.

[5] William Troussebot, son of Geoffrey, son of Paganus, married Aubrey de Harcourt. They had estates in Yorkshire; see *Monast. Anglic.*, t. ii. p. 43. He was governor of Bonneville-sur-Touque in 1138, an office hereditary in that family, one branch of which possessed domains in the neighbourhood of Bonneville, which was a royal residence. The original seat of the family of Troussebot is supposed to have been in the north-western part of the district of Neuborg, near that of Robert I. de Harcourt, father of Aubrey, who was married to William Troussebot.

[6] We have no information respecting Haimon de Falaise; but Geoffrey and William de Falaise were witnesses to a charter by William de Briose, and its confirmation by William the Conqueror. The latter especially seems to have been a person of importance, being mentioned before Roger Bigot and Humphrey de Bohun. *Monast. Anglic.* t. i. p. 541.

[7] Guigan Algaso had been viscount d'Exmes, and appears with that title in several charters of St. Evroult. Robert de Bostare is unknown.

and many others, are examples of what I have stated. Having acquired wealth and built themselves mansions, they established a position far beyond that of their fathers, and often revenged themselves on those who had lorded over them, by false and unjust accusations. These and many others of humble birth, whom it would be tedious to mention individually, were ennobled by the king; his royal authority raising them from a low estate to the summit of power, so that they became formidable even to the greatest nobles.

While however, King Henry, heaped such munificent rewards on his faithful adherents, he was an implacable enemy to the disloyal, sparing none who where convicted from punishment, either in their person, or by fines, or forfeiture of their honours. Many criminals had miserable experience of this, having ended their days in the king's prisons, from which neither their high connections, or noble descent, or the offer of an enormous ransom could procure their release. Robert de Pontefract[1] and Robert Malet[2] having been prosecuted in the king's court, were condemned to forfeit their honours, and depart the realm. Ivo[3] had set the example of engaging in war on his own account, and given to the flames the territories of his neighbours, such private wars being hitherto unknown in England,[4] and being therefore severely punished. Upon this charge from which he could not clear himself, he was mulct by the king's stern justice in a heavy fine, and involved in the deepest trouble and distress. In consequence, the knight

[1] Robert de Laci, lord of Pontefract. See before p. 277.

[2] Robert Malet, son of William Malet one of the companions of the Conqueror, was made sheriff of Yorkshire. Robert was also a favourite with that king, who granted him vast estates in Suffolk, as well as with Henry I., to whom he was chamberlain before his disgrace. He had a sister named Beatrice, and a brother, named Gilbert Malet. See in the *Monast. Anglic.* t. i. p. 356, the charter of foundation for an abbey of Benedictine monks, which he founded at his residence at Eye, in Suffolk, during the Conqueror's lifetime.

[3] Ivo de Grantmesnil, fourth son of Hugh de Grantmesnil.

[4] The private wars which devastated Normandy during the minority of William the Conqueror, and under the weak government of his son Robert, were for the most part unknown in England till the turbulence of the Anglo-Norman barons became unrestrained during the distracted reign of King Stephen.

implored the assistance of Robert Earl of Mellent, one of Henry's principal counsellors, and was driven by many unhappy circumstances to place himself under the earl's protection. In the first place, he was galled by the derision with which he was assailed as one of the rope-dancers, who had been let down from the walls of Antioch;[1] and besides, on deep reflection, he was afraid that he should never, or without great difficulty, reinstate himself in the king's favour which he had lost.[2] He therefore resolved to join the crusade again, and made an agreement with the earl of Mellent to the following effect. The earl was to procure his reconciliation with the king, and to advance him five hundred silver marks for the expenses of his expedition, having the whole of Ivo's domains pledged to him as a security for fifteen years. In consideration of this, the earl was to give the daughter of his brother Henry, earl of Warwick, in marriage to Ivo's son, who was yet in his infancy, and to restore him his father's inheritance. This contract was confirmed by oath, and ratified by the king's consent. Ivo then set out on his pilgrimage, accompanied by his wife; but he died on the road, and his inheritance passed into the hands of strangers.[3]

The town of Leicester had four masters, the king, the bishop of Lincoln, Earl Simon,[4] and Ivo, son of Hugh. The earl of Mellent contrived to get a footing in it by the posession of Hugh's share, who was chief of the municipality and viscount, and also farmed the king's fourth of the borough. By the royal favour and his own address he got the whole place into his own hands, and being, in consequence, created an English earl, his wealth and power surpassed those of any other peer of the realm, and he was exalted above almost all his family. He married the beau-

[1] *Funambuli.* See before pp. 128, 194.

[2] Ivo de Grantmesnil's predilection for the duke Robert, one of whose evil counsellors he was from the first, and his aversion to the two brothers of that prince, began early. See vol ii. pp. 108, 109.

[3] In spite of the claims of Ivo the Younger, his English patrimony remained in the hands of the earl of Mellent, whose grandson Robert, earl of Leicester, reunited the rest of the vast estates of the family of Grantmesnil, by his marriage with Petronilla de Grantmesnil, this Ivo's daughter.

[4] Simon de Senlis, earl of Huntingdon in right of his wife Matilda, daughter of the unfortunate Earl Waltheof. See vol. ii. p. 49.

tiful Isabel, niece of the king of France,[1] by whom he had twin-sons, Waleran,[2] and Robert,[3] and another son called Hugh the Poor,[4] with five daughters. His conscience blinded by such prosperity, he forfeited his oath in favour of Ivo's son, so that at the time appointed the young man did not obtain the wife he had been promised, nor recover his hereditary estates according to the contract to which the earl of Mellent had sworn.

CH. III. *Robert de Belèsme in open rebellion against King Henry — The king's campaign against him — Takes his castles of Arundel, Bridgnorth, and Shrewsbury, and drives him out of England — He raises disturbances in Normandy The duke's campaign against him.*

IN the year of our Lord 1102, the tenth indiction, King Henry summoned the powerful earl, Robert de Belèsme, to plead in his court to an indictment containing forty-five counts of offences, in word or act, against himself or his brother, the duke of Normandy; and the earl was required to make a distinct answer to each charge. The king had employed a whole year in having him closely watched, causing his evil deeds to be carefully inquired into by secret spies, and reduced to writing with great precision. Robert demanded licence, as the custom is, for himself and his friends to attend the trial, and, it being granted, finding that it was out of his power to clear himself of the charges alleged, he departed at once, and with his retainers mounting swift horses, fled with alarm in breathless haste to his own castles. Meanwhile, the king and his barons were waiting for Robert's answer, until one of the royal attendants brought the news of his sudden flight. Henry was vexed at having been thus duped, but rested sure that the day of vengeance would soon arrive.

In consequence, the king publicly branded Robert for not having legally cleared himself of the crimes with which

[1] Elizabeth de Vermandois, niece of Philip I.

[2] Waleran was count de Meulan, or earl of Mellent, after his father.

[3] Robert I., earl of Leicester, surnamed the Hunchback.

[4] Hugh the Poor, earl of Bedford. See the "Acts of King Stephen," printed with Henry of Huntingdon's History in *Antiq. Lib.*, pp. 346 and 380.

he had been charged in open court, and proclaimed him a traitor unless he returned, and submitting to judgment, was ready to do right. The rebel, being once more summoned to appear in court, gave a flat refusal, and, what is more, lost no time in adding to the fortifications of his castles in every quarter by trenches and walls, and in demanding aid from his Norman kinsmen, and the alien Welsh, and all his allies. The king called out the whole military array of England, and laying siege to Arundel castle, which stands near the sea-coast,[1] he erected forts, and stationed his officers in them with bodies of troops for three months. Meanwhile the garrison of the fortress humbly requested the king to grant them a truce, that they might either obtain succour from their lord, or his licence to give up the place. The king acceding to their proposal, messengers were despatched to Robert, who was then in the province of Mercia, and having found him, laid before him in great distress the severe chastisement with which the king's attack threatened them. The earl was then building the very strong castle of Bridgnorth, on the river Severn, in that country, and trying, in vain, to levy an auxiliary force, for the purpose of making a resolute defence. He was deeply grieved at learning the defection of his vassals at Arundel, but as he could not afford them any aid, he released them from the fealty they owed him, and with great reluctance gave them permission to come to terms with the king. On the return of the messengers, the garrison of Arundel gladly surrendered the castle into the king's hands, and were honourably and kindly treated, receiving large presents. The king then marched his army to Blithe, a castle formerly belonging to Roger de Buthli,[2] where the garrison came out to meet him with joy, and acknowledging him as their liege lord, submitted to him with great readiness. After these events King Henry allowed his people to enjoy a short interval of repose, and the great bulk of the nobility found reason to dread his prudence and valour.

[1] Arundel castle, now belonging to the Howards, dukes of Norfolk, stands on the bank of the river Arun at some distance from the sea.

[2] Blythe in Nottinghamshire. Respecting this castle and its former possessor, Roger de Bulli, see before, p. 220.

Meanwhile, the king sent envoys to Normandy, bearing authentic despatches to the duke, informing him that Robert de Belèsme was an outlaw in both countries, having fled clandestinely from the royal court. He then reminded him that, according to the treaty they had concluded in England, they were to unite in punishing traitors with extreme vengeance. The duke therefore summoned to his standard the military force of Normandy, and laid siege to the castle of Vignats,[1] which was in the keeping of Girard de St. Hilary.[2] The garrison hoped for an assault, being prepared to surrender the place, if the attack was vigorous. They could not honourably capitulate without fighting, lest they should justly merit to be branded as disloyal deserters. But the duke being lost in sloth and indolence, and wanting the firmness becoming a prince, Robert de Montfort,[3] and other conspirators, who were not in agreement between themselves, set fire to their encampment, and, throwing the whole army into confusion, fled of their own accord, though no one pursued them, compelling others also, who, detesting Robert, wished his humiliation, to join in their shameful flight. The garrison of Vignats, witnessing the disgrace of the Norman army, raised shouts of derision after them as they ran away, and afterwards, having little to fear, began to make cruel irruptions into the territory of Oxmes. Robert de Grantmesnil, Hugh de Montpinçon, and Robert de Courci,[4] with their vassals, made all the resistance in their power to the savage freebooters, and endeavoured to protect their domains. But the outlaws, flushed with their success in pillaging, became bolder in their attacks, and proudly boasting of their castles at Gunter, Fourches, and Argentan,[5] were greatly incensed that any of their neigh-

[1] Vignats, two leagues and a half from Falaise.

[2] There are six communes of the name of St. Hilaire in Normandy, four of which are in the department of the Orne. Gerard must necessarily have belonged to that which forms part of the canton of Séez, and which has preserved the name of St. Hilaire-le-Girard in memory of its ancient lords.

[3] Robert de Montfort who, as we have seen before, commanded the army of William Rufus in his expedition to Maine.

[4] Robert, eldest son of Hugh de Grantmesnil; Hugh de Montpinçon and Robert de Courci were his brothers-in-law.

[5] Château Gontier-au-Houlme, a fortress now ruined, in the commune

bours, without the duke at their head, should even venture to snarl[1] at them. They therefore plundered the peasants through the whole province, and carrying off their booty, set fire to the houses.

Meanwhile, the king of England did not, like his brother, abandon himself to sloth, but in the autumn arrayed the military force of the whole of England, and leading them into Mercia, besieged Bridgnorth for three months. Robert de Belèsme had retired to Shrewsbury, entrusting the defence of Bridgnorth to Roger, son of Corbet,[2] Robert de Neuville, and Ulger the hunter,[3] with eighty stipendiary men-at-arms. He had now entered into an alliance with the Welsh, and attached to his cause, Cadogan and Gervase,[4] sons of Rees, frequently employing the troops to beat up the quarters of the royal army. He had disinherited William Pantoul, a brave and experienced knight, and had even given him a sharp repulse when he proffered his valuable services at the time they were urgently needed. Being thus rejected with disdain, William Pantulf[5] went over to the king, who, having already proved his vigour of mind, received him graciously. He gave him the command of two hundred men, and entrusted to him the custody of Stafford castle, in the same neighbourhood. This knight proved Robert de Belèsme's worst enemy, never ceasing from persecuting him both by his counsels and his arms till his ruin was completed.

The earls[6] and barons of the realm now met and con-

of La Courbe, near Argentan Econché; so called because it stands on a peninsula formed by the river Orne; not Château-Gontier in the department of La Sarthe; Fourches, in the canton of Coulibœuf.

[1] *Vel latrare.*

[2] Roger, son of Corbet, and Robert his eldest brother, are mentioned in the charters relating to the foundation of the abbey of Shrewsbury to which they were benefactors. See also vol. ii. pp. 48, 49.

[3] We do not find the names of Robert de Neuville (probably of Neuville near Séez), nor the hunter Welger in the above charter, but that of another hunter attached to the family of Belèsme, *Normannus Venator.* See *Monast. Anglic.* t. i. p. 375, &c.

[4] It is not always easy to discover the real names of the Welsh princes in our author's version of them. Cadogan and his brother were probably sons of Rhys-ap-Owen, who was slain in 1076. See vol. ii. p. 449.

[5] For William Pantulf, or Pantoul, see vol. ii. b. v. c. xvi. pp. 207, and following.

[6] Our author now returns from his digression to the siege of Bridgnorth.

sulted together as to the means of reconciling the rebellious earl to his sovereign. They said among themselves: "Should the king succeed in crushing this mighty earl and carry his resentment so far as to disinherit him, as he is endeavouring to do, he will then trample us all under foot like feeble women. Let us therefore use our utmost efforts to plant the seeds of concord between them, that we may serve in a lawful way both our sovereign and our brother peer, and thus make both of them our debtors by putting an end to their quarrels. In consequence, one day they all went to the king in a body, and earnestly addressing him in the middle of the camp, used a variety of arguments calculated to soften the royal asperity. At that moment there happened to be some provincial troops, to the number of three thousand, drawn up on a hill close by, who becoming aware of the intentions of the nobles, shouted aloud to the king: "Henry, lord king, trust not these traitors. They are endeavouring to deceive you, and prevent the vigorous exercise of your royal justice. Why do you listen to those who persuade you to pardon a traitor, and let the conspiracy against your life go unpunished? For ourselves, we are all ready to stand by you faithfully and second all your undertakings. Press the siege vigorously; close in upon the traitor on all sides; and make no peace till you take him, alive or dead."

The king's resolution was strengthened by the voice of the people, and returning shortly after listening to them, he negatived the proposals of the factious nobles. He then made overtures to the Welsh princes through William Pantulf, and allured them by presents and promises subtilly used, to desert the cause of his enemy and join his own with all their forces. He also sent for three of the principal townsmen, and swore to them publicly that unless the place was surrendered to him within three days he would hang all of them he could lay his hands on. They were terrified at the king's violence, and thinking it time to look to their own safety, sought a conference with William Pantulf, who was a neighbour of theirs, that they might hear what he advised. The knight undertook to negotiate between the garrison and the king, and in persuasive language recommended them to surrender the fortress to their lawful king, on whose part he

engaged to augment their funds by granting them lands of the value of three hundred pounds in annual rent. The townsmen, having taken into consideration what was for the common good, agreed to this, and submitted to the royal pleasure rather than risk their lives by further resistance. At last, with the king's leave, they sent envoys to Robert de Belèsme their lord, informing him that they could not hold out any longer against the attack of the powerful king. The stipendiary troops were kept in ignorance of the capitulation, the regular garrison and the burgesses having concluded it, to save their lives, without consulting the others. When however they discovered what was thus unexpectedly arranged, they flew to arms in great dudgeon and tried to render the negotiation abortive. The garrison soldiers however blockaded them in one part of the fortress, and let in the king's troops, with a royal ensign, amidst the cheers of the townsmen. The king, taking into consideration that the stipendiaries had faithfully performed their service to their lord, as was their duty, gave them free liberty to depart with their horses and arms. Marching out of the castle in great tribulation they made public complaints of having been shamefully outwitted by the garrison and chiefs of the municipality, protesting before the whole army against their disaster being considered a slur on the character of stipendiary troops, and throwing the whole blame on the treachery of their comrades.

When Robert de Belèsme received intelligence that the king had reduced his castle of Bridgnorth, on which he greatly relied, he was in the greatest distress, and, driven almost frantic, was at a loss what course to take. The king now issued orders for his army to march by the Huvel Hegen,[1] and lay siege to Shrewsbury, which stands on a rising ground washed on three sides by the river Severn. The road through a wood on this route is called by the English Huvel Hegen, which in Latin means *malum callem vel vicum* (bad road or street.) This road was for a thousand paces full of holes, and the surface rough with large stones, and so narrow that two men on horseback could scarcely pass

[1] The literal translation of these words in modern English would be *Evil-Hedge ;* the intrepretation given by our author a few lines before is therefore not quite exact.

each other. It was overshadowed on both sides by a thick wood in which bowmen were placed in ambush ready to inflict sudden wounds with hissing bolts and arrows on the troops on their march. There were more than sixty thousand infantry in the expedition, and the king gave orders that they should clear a broad track by cutting down the wood with axes, so that a road might be formed for his own passage and a public highway for ever afterwards. The royal command was promptly performed, and vast numbers of men being employed, the wood was felled, and a very broad road levelled through it.

Robert de Belèsme was extremely terrified when he heard of Henry's movements, and finding himself surrounded by perils, was compelled to submit to the humiliation of imploring pardon from the invincible monarch. The stern king, however, could not forget the injuries he had received, and determined to follow up the attack with his powerful army until he had forced his enemy to surrender at discretion. At last, Robert was driven to despair by his unhappy fate, and, after consulting his friends, went to meet the king as he approached the town, and confessing his treasonable offences laid the keys of the place at his feet. Thus King Henry became master of all the estates of Robert and his vassals who had joined him in the rebellion, but he permitted him to retire unmolested, with his horses and arms, and gave him a safe conduct through England to the coast. When the banishment of the cruel tyrant was known all England was in a tumult of joy, and numbers congratulated the king with flattering words, to this effect: "Rejoice, King Henry, and return thanks to the Lord your God, for you began to reign independently from the moment you reduced Robert de Belèsme to subjection, and drove him out of your kingdom."

Robert de Belèsme having been thus expelled, the realm of Albion enjoyed peace and tranquillity, and during the thirty-three years of Henry's subsequent reign no one afterwards dared to revolt in England, nor held any fortress against him. Robert crossed over to Normandy boiling with rage and overwhelmed with grief; and making fierce attacks on those of his countrymen who had joined the standard of their weak prince, he chastised them severely

with fire and sword. For like the dragon mysteriously described by St. John in the Apocalypse, who, cast forth from heaven, cruelly vented his wrath on the dwellers upon the earth, so this bloody butcher when driven from England spent his fury on the Normans. Sweeping their farms of all that could be carried off, he devoted them to the flames, and inflicted the torments of death or mutilation on the soldiers and others who fell into his hands. Indeed, so great was his cruelty that he preferred torturing his prisoners to enriching himself by the large ransoms he might have obtained.

Roger of Poitiers and Arnulph, Robert's brother,[1] were wealthy English earls, and through the care of their father, the earl, Roger de Montgomery, obtained great honours and domains. Arnulph married the daughter of an Irish king called Lafracoth in right of whom he aspired to get possession of her father's kingdom.[2] Insatiable ambition in attempting to gain more than is right often forfeits suddenly what has been justly acquired. The powerful king of England was so incensed against Robert's whole kindred and race, that he resolved to root them all out of his dominions. In consequence he sought favourable opportunities of dealing harshly with the two brothers, and making vigilant inquiries into such as occurred, he declared their estates forfeited and banished them from England. So implacable was his resentment that the nuns of Almenèches[3] were cruelly stripped of the lands with which Earl Roger the elder had endowed them, because their abbess, Emma, was sister of the young earls, and the king granted them to Savaric, son of Chama,[4] in knight-service.

[1] See what has been said before of these two brothers of Roger de Belèsme, vol. ii. p. 203, and in the present vol. p. 277.

[2] Some further account of Arnulph's Irish affairs will be found in a subsequent chapter (xviii.) of the present book.

[3] The abbey of Almenèches at Mortrée between Argentan and Séez. It was a monastery of nuns as early as the eighth century, under the direction of St. Lanthilde, and is supposed to have been one of the twelve religious houses founded by St. Evroult. After the Normans established themselves in that country, it was given to the monks of Fécamp by Richard II., and subsequently ceded by them to Roger de Montgomery who re-established it as an abbey of nuns in 1070. The first abbess was named Adelasie. Emma, Roger's daughter, replaced her in 1074, and lived till March 4, 1113.

[4] Savaric, son of Cham or Cane, was a brother of Hubert de Suzanne,

The expulsion of these nobles from England aggravated the state of bitter evil in Normandy, and during three years endless crimes were perpetrated there. Many villages were burnt, and the churches, with the inhabitants who fled to them for refuge as to a mother's bosom, were set on fire. Almost all Normandy rose in arms against Robert, and there was a general league to resist his tyranny; but these attempts proved fruitless, because there was no one of capacity to take the lead against the powerful freebooter. He had vast resources and great talents, and the immense wealth he had been long gathering was laid up in thirty-four strong castles, which he had formerly erected to support his rebellion. Having sole possession of nearly the whole of his father's inheritance, he relinquished no part of it to his brothers, who had forfeited their English estates through him. In consequence Roger retired to the castle of Charroux, which he possessed in right of his wife, and living there till he became old, left at his death brave sons, who became his heirs.[1] Arnulph, after many thankless enterprises in his brother's cause, became so indignant, that he went over to the duke, to whom he ceded the castle of Almenèches which he had taken by surprise, and collected about him many of his brother's partisans.[2] In consequence, there were great disturbances in the district of Séez, many of the provincials leaving Robert to join Arnulph, and giving up their castles to the duke's adherents. Robert, thus deserted by his own brother, suffered such alarms from all quarters that he scarcely trusted any one, and as he was an object of terror to all the world, he even doubted the sincerity of those who still adhered to him.

as we have seen before, vol. ii. p. 505. Cane, or Cham, was his mother's name; she was the second wife of Ralph, viscount of Maine.

[1] Roger-le-Poitevin retired to the castle of Charroux, near Civrai, where he passed the rest of his life, as our author states. He was engaged in constant hostilities with Hugh II., lord of Lusignan, surnamed the Devil, who disputed with him the county of La Marche. He bequeathed the war to his son, Albert III., and his grandson, Albert IV.

[2] We shall find a further account of Arnulph in 1118. He gave to the abbey of St. Martin de Séez the church of St. Nicholas, within the walls of the castle at Pembroke, in 1098. It was afterwards erected into a priory, endowed as a cell of the same abbey by William Marshall. Some picturesque ruins of the church of this priory (afterwards called Monkton) are still standing.

In the month of June the duke's army assembled at the convent of nuns (at Almenèches), prepared to ravage the country, and made stables of the sacred buildings. Robert, hearing this, flew to the spot, and setting the abbey on fire, took prisoners Oliver de Frênai[1] and several others, some of whom he subjected to the miseries of a long and severe imprisonment, and sentenced the others to death, or mutilation of their limbs. Duke Robert and his army marched to Exmes for the purpose of protecting his adherents. Robert de Laci,[2] who had then command of his troops, had given the custody of that castle to Malger, surnamed Malaherbe.[3] Numbers were filled with delight at the disasters which now threatened their odious tyrant, and joined the expedition against him full of zeal. William, count of Evreux, Rotro, count of Mortain, Gilbert de Laigle,[4] and all the people of Exmes leagued together to oppose him, but they were unable to fulfil their desire to the full extent of exacting from him a fitting recompence for the many wrongs they had suffered at his hands. However, Robert de St. Ceneri,[5] and Burcard his steward, with Hugh de Nonant,[6] made a long

[1] There are a dozen communes in Normandy of this name, and it is not known to which of them Oliver belonged. He was probably a son or relation of Odo-the-Red of Frénai, mentioned in a charter of William de Briose in favour of St. Florent de Saumur, confirmed by William the Conqueror. See *Monastic Anglic.* v. i. p. 584.

[2] Robert de Laci, son of Walter who was present at the Conquest, and probably nephew of Ilbert, held more than a hundred and twenty manors in England; but he forfeited them in 1092, and was compelled to retire to Normandy in consequence of the part he took in Robert de Mowbray's conspiracy. See before, p. 277.

[3] There have been, and still are, several noble families in Normandy of the name of Malherbe. Mauger de Malherbe probably belonged to that of Adam de *Malaherba* mentioned in the great charter of the Trinity of Neubourg by William, count de Mortain, in 1105, as a benefactor to that house. In England John de Malherbe appears to have been the founder of the priory of Thornyholm, in Yorkshire, about the time of King Stephen.

[4] Rotrou and Gilbert were the immediate neighbours of Robert de Belêsme, and by inevitable consequence always at war with him.

[5] For Robert de St. Ceneri, second of the name, see before, vol. ii. p. 459.

[6] Hugh de Nonant-sur-Quenge, one of the favourites of Robert Curthose. See vol. ii. p. 453. He must not be confounded with another person of the same name, who was cotemporary with Henry II., and nephew of

resistance against him, and inflicted on him more loss and disgrace than any other Normans had done.

On the approach of the duke's army, Robert drew out his forces, and after making several false attacks on his inactive prince, fell upon him with great impetuosity at Challoux,[1] taking William de Conversana,[2] brother of the countess Sibylla, and several other prisoners. The brave Normans were filled with shame, that after their brilliant victories over foreign nations, in barbarous regions, they should be now vanquished and put to flight in the bosom of their own country by one of her sons; while Robert, encouraged beyond measure by his success, engaged in the boldest enterprises, and thenceforth held the duke so cheap, that he contemplated the conquest of the whole of Normandy. Meanwhile, the inhabitants of the country, having no leader, and not being able to support the cruel tyranny of the warlike count, bowed their necks under his yoke, though with great reluctance, becoming his adherents from fear instead of love; and under his protection carried on fierce hostilities against their neighbours, with whom they were at variance. The duke's influence being thus on the wane, Robert still became more formidable, and the lords of the adjacent fiefs going over to his side, he got possession of the fortress at Exmes. He also reduced the castle of Gunter,[3] and some others in his neighbourhood.

The abbey of nuns at Almenèches having been burnt as already stated, the feeble society of virgins was miserably dispersed. Each, as hazard furnished the means, returned

Arnulph, bishop of Lisieux. This other Hugh de Nonant was probably the bishop of Chester in 1194, of whom Matthew Paris speaks.

Our author has already mentioned twice in his eighth book Hugh de Nonant as one of the lords most exposed to the violence and treachery of Robert de Belèsme; he describes him as of moderate means, *pauper oppidanus*, but, notwithstanding, as so resolute that he resisted his powerful neighbour for a number of years, and was successful in making reprisals on him.

[1] M. Du Bois places the field of this battle at Chailloué, a short distance from Séez, on the road to Nonant. M. Le Prevost considers it to have been fought between Le Viel-Urou and Briquetière (Ste. Anastasie).

[2] He was also one of the principal counsellors of his brother the duke.

[3] We find (p. 333) this castle in the hands of some of the brigands of the country, who were in arms against the duke; probably the count retook it from them.

to the houses of their relations or friends. Emma, the abbess, with three of the sisterhood, took refuge at Ouche, and abode for six months in the chapel where the holy father St. Evroult, intent on heavenly contemplations, had dwelt in solitude. The year following she returned to her own monastery, and by the aid of God and his faithful servants endeavoured to restore it from its ruins. She lived nearly ten years afterwards, in the course of which by great exertions she erected the church of the Virgin Mother, with the buildings required for regular order, and took great pains to collect the scattered nuns, and bring them back to the cloister. On her death she was succeeded by Matilda, her brother Philip's daughter, who, when the abbey was again injured by an accidental fire,[1] carefully repaired the church and buildings.

CH. IV. *Deaths of Walter Giffard and the Duchess Sibylla —Their epitaphs—Continued hostilities in Normandy.*

AT the same time, several distinguished barons in Normandy, namely, Walter Giffard, William de Breteuil, and Ralph de Conches, departed this life, and were succeeded by young men. Walter Giffard, earl of Buckingham, died in England, and his body was brought over to Normandy, as he had ordered, and buried at the entrance of the church of the blessed Virgin Mary, at Longueville.[2] His epitaph was inscribed on the wall, which was ornamented with pictures:

> Among his sires, the lords of Longueville,
> His bones to rest was WALTER GIFFARD'S will;
> Borne hither from fair England's shores to lie
> In his own work, St. Mary's priory.
> The generous knight, his country's faithful son,
> Gave to religion what his valour won;
> And Cluni's grateful monks rejoice to raise
> This pictured tablet to their founder's praise.

The monks of Cluni paid great honours to this baron's memory, and commended his soul to the Lord God by

[1] It has been already stated that Emma died March 4, 1113; all that we know of her niece Matilda is that she died on the 6th July.

[2] Longueville-la-Giffard, near Dieppe. Walter Giffard, the second of that name, died July 15, 1102. He founded in 1084 the priory of Sainte-Foi at Longueville. It was this lord who was with the army of William Rufus when he invaded the Vexin in 1097, and not his father, Walter I., as we stated in mistake. The latter died before 1084.

incessant prayers, mindful of the benefits they richly enjoyed on his foundation at Longueville. His wife Agnes was sister of Anselm de Ribemont, and fifteen years after their marriage gave birth to a son, who was named Walter.[1] After his father's death, she carefully educated him until he arrived at manhood, and managed his hereditary domains for him many years with great prudence. This lady, giving way to the feelings of her sex, formed an affection for Duke Robert, and entangled him in an illicit connection, by the blandishments of love. Promising him succour against his enemies, both from her own resources and those of her powerful relations, she induced the silly duke to engage that on the death of his present wife, he would not only marry her, but entrust to her the government of the whole of Normandy.

Not long afterwards the duchess Sibylla took to her bed, infected by poison, and died in the season of Lent, to the general sorrow.[2] William, archbishop of Rouen, celebrated her obsequies with the clergy and people, respectfully interring her in the church of St. Mary, mother of God. Her grave in the nave of the church is covered with a polished slab of white marble, on which the following epitaph may be distinctly seen.

Not birth, nor beauty, rank, or power,
Can lengthen this life's fleeting hour;
Ev'n the illustrious SIBYLLE must,
Laid in this tomb, return to dust.
Apulia mourns her daughter's fate,
And Normandy is desolate;
The duchess gone, whose conduct pure,
And all that could her hopes secure
The wisdom to promote her weal
And liberal hand her wounds to heal
She lost, when in the Golden Fleece
The bright sun shone: God give her peace.

[1] Walter Giffard, third of that name, died in 1164, according to Robert du Mont (*Hist. de France*, t. xiii. p. 309), without leaving any issue by his wife Ermengarde.

[2] This duchess had, according to the continuator of Jumièges, more intelligence and capacity for business than her husband, who often entrusted her with the administration of affairs during his absence. Sibylla paid dearly during her short residence in Normandy for the mistake she made in quitting the delicious climate and advanced civilization of Italy to attach herself to a prince who possessed neither talent nor morals.

After these occurrences, the tumults of war which had already commenced, spread, from circumstances which suddenly happened, through almost the whole of Normandy. They raged so furiously that the duke was unable to marry again, and Agnes, remaining a widow, aspired in vain to share the bed of her sovereign.

At that time violent hostilities broke out between the people of Breteuil, Evreux, and others in that neighbourhood. William de Breteuil had married Adeline, the daughter of Hugh de Montfort, but he had no son born in wedlock. He died at Bec on the second of the ides [the 12th] of January, but was buried at Lire, in the abbey which his father had founded on his own fief. His nephews William de Guader[1] and Reynold de Grancei[2] disputed the succession; but the Normans chose Eustace, his son by a concubine, preferring a countryman of their own, although he was a bastard, to a Burgundian or Breton of legitimate birth. In consequence, the parties flew to arms with great violence, and the country was still further desolated. William de Guader dying soon afterwards Reynold became stronger, and William earl of Evreux joined with many others in affording him aid. Ralph de Conches,[3] son of Isabel, Ascelin Goël,[4] and Amauri de Montfort[5] collected their forces on the side of Reynold, and did much mischief to their neighbours, devastating their country by hostile inroads, but they rendered but little service to the cause they espoused. For Eustace, supported by William Alis, Ralph-the-Red,[6]

[1] William de Guader, son of Ralph de Guader (see vol. ii. p. 78), and eldest brother of Ralph II. de Guader, who will appear hereafter. There was a third brother, Alan de Guader, who accompanied his father to the crusade, and probably never returned. See before, p. 97.

[2] Reynold de Grancei, of the noble house of Grancei in Burgundy. We shall have an opportunity in the sequel of speaking of this person and his family.

[3] Ralph de Conches, third of that name, son of Isabel, of Montfort l'Amauri.

[4] Ascelin Gouel, lord of Ivri, son of Robert Gouel, lord of Bréval.

[5] Amauri de Montfort, third of that name, brother of Isabel.

[6] William Alis was one of the principal vassals of the lords of Breteuil. This family gave its name to two mills, one at Breteuil, the other at Carentonne near Bernai, an estate which it had held for a long period. The father of this person was witness of the confirmation by William Fitz-Osborne of the grant of Guernanville to St. Evroult. The name of the

Theobald, and other barons, made a brave resistance, and by their advice he implored help from the king of England against his numerous adversaries. The king gave him his daughter Juliana in marriage, promising him effectual succour against Goël and all his other enemies. At the same time he married another daughter to Rotro count of Mortain, who bore her husband a daughter named Philippa.[1]

CH. V. *Paschal II. visits France—Goes to Chartres—Character and history of Adela, countess de Blois—Her children and death.*

IN the year of our Lord 1103,[2] Pope Paschal paid a visit to France, and being received with great honours faithfully performed his sacred office. The venerable Ivo, bishop of Chartres, was then distinguished among the doctors of France for his learning, both sacred and profane, and, on his invitation, the pope celebrated the feast of Easter at Chartres. The Countess Adela contributed large sums for the pope's expenses, and received the benediction of the apostolical see for herself and her house for ever. That honourable lady, on her husband's pilgrimage, took upon herself the government of his county, and carefully educated their children to become protectors of holy church.[3]

William, the eldest, married the daughter of Gilo de Sulli, and succeeding to the domains of his father-in-law had a

one or other of them appears in Domesday-book as tenant *in capite* in Hampshire. The one mentioned by our author was probably the donor of lands to the canons of the priory of St. Denys, near Southampton, confirmed a long time afterwards by Geoffrey Laci, bishop of Winchester. See the *Monastic Anglic.* v. xi. p. 110.

Ralph-the-Red, lord of Pont-Echanfré, now Notre-Dame-du-Hamel. The third person mentioned is unknown. He was probably, like Ralph-the-Red, from the neighbourhood of St. Evroult, so that our author did not think it necessary to point him out more distinctly.

[1] The name of this natural daughter of Henry I. was Matilda.

[2] Our author is mistaken in his date of this visit of the pope, which did not take place till 1107. He left Cluni in the month of February, and arrived at St. Denys in April.

[3] The countess Adela, a woman of great spirit and a warm heart, possessed a more cultivated understanding than either of her brothers. It is supposed that the history of Normandy which has the singular title of *Draco Normanicus*, was composed for her. La Porte du Theil has given the contents of the chapters in his *Notices et Extraits des MSS. de la Bibliothèque du Roi.*

long and peaceable life, and left a worthy offspring, Odo, Rahier. * * * * * *[1]

Theobald,[2] count Palatine, distinguished himself in the wars, but he loved peace and ruled with equity, and was the most eminent of the princes of France for wealth and valour. He married Matilda, daughter of Duke Ingelbert, and after the death of King Henry, his uncle, obtained the duchy of Normandy and checked the savage feuds of his subjects by using freely the rod of lawful discipline.

As for Stephen, the third son of Stephen de Blois, having been knighted by his uncle Henry, and taken prisoner William count of Mortain at the battle of Tinchebrai, the king granted him that county. He married Matilda, daughter of Eustace count of Boulogne, by his wife Mary; and in her right inherited all his states. At last, when King Henry died at the castle of Lions on the fourth of the nones [the 2nd] of December, Stephen crossed the sea and was crowned king of England in the beginning of the year 1136.

In the last place, Henry, the youngest son [of Stephen de Blois] became a monk of Cluni while he was yet a boy; he was made abbot of Glastonbury when a young man, and afterwards promoted to the see of Winchester on the death of William Giffard.[3]

[1] The MS. of St. Evroult has a blank in this place which is only noticed in one of the printed editions. As William de Blois had, as it will shortly appear, three children besides the two here named, it was probably intended to be filled up with their names. This William de Blois, the eldest brother of this illustrious family, was deformed and stammered; he was also narrow-minded and subject to violent bursts of passion. He married the daughter of Gilo de Sulli of whom we have had occasion to speak on several occasions. From disgust to the memory of parents who had disinherited him, he took the name and arms of his wife, who bore him five children, three sons and two daughters. His third son, Henry, had the abbey of Fécamp given him by his uncle, King Stephen, and lived till 1189. Margaret, his eldest daughter, married Henry, count d'Eu, and Elizabeth, the second, was abbess of Caen, as appears before, vol. ii. p. 377.

[2] Theobald IV., surnamed the Great, married Matilda, daughter of Engelbert, duke of Carinthia and Frioul. He will appear on the stage in the course of this history as a supporter of his uncle and brother.

[3] The two last of these sons of Stephen and Adela will become prominent actors in the sequel of our author's history, and afford many opportunities of referring to them. It is only necessary to remark at present that our author fixes the coronation of King Stephen in the year 1136, because he

At length the mother of this illustrious progeny, began to reflect on the dark hour of the shades of death, after enjoying great wealth and those delights, the abundance of which corrupts and ruins the souls of sinners; she therefore voluntarily resigned the fleeting pleasures and vain pomps of the world, and becoming a nun at Marcigni[1] under the severe rule of the Cluniac order, devoted herself to the service of the King of Sabaoth. I have anticipated the current events in giving this account of an illustrious mother and her prosperous offspring, the end of whose uncertain fortunes I cannot yet know. I must now recur to the regular course of my narrative, from which I have somewhat digressed.[2]

CH. VI. *King Henry interferes to settle the disputes respecting the succession to William de Breteuil's fiefs—During the hostilities, a rich burgess carried off by surprise.*

THE king of England commissioned Robert, earl of Mellent, to put an end to the intestine divisions of Normandy, enjoining Duke Robert and the other lords to support his son-in-law, and oppose his enemies, or they would otherwise incur the consequences of his royal indignation. In consequence many of them, on understanding that Eustace enjoyed the king's favour, remained quiet, and those who had most opposed him were the first to render him aid. Reynold, however, and Goël,[3] with other bold men, persisted in their iniquitous enterprises, and instead of paying any respect to the royal injunction, refused to desist from their attacks on the king's son-in-law; and with wicked daring still carried fire and sword through the country. Among Reynold's other cruel deeds, having taken by assault one of the enemy's castles, he intercepted the whole garrison as they were

begins the year at Christmas, but the ceremony was performed on the 26th December, the feast of the patron saint of the new king.

[1] At the priory of Marcigni-sur-Loire, founded in 1056 by St. Hugh, abbot of Cluni. She took the veil before 1117, and died there in 1137, according to the continuator of William de Jumièges.

[2] Our author now returns to the competitors for the inheritance of William de Breteuil, having broken the thread of his narrative very unfortunately, for the purpose of introducing the visit of the pope to Chartres four years before it took place.

[3] Ascelin de Goël, lord of Bréval and Ivri.

marching out, and plunging his own sword into the bosom of each individual, butchered them all without mercy, as if they had been brute beasts. Becoming universally odious, principally on account of this barbarity, and Eustace obtaining signal successes and recovering the whole of his father's fief, Reynold was driven out of Normandy. On his return to his native country, he began to plot against William [de Guader], his elder brother, but, by a just judgment of God, while he was fomenting disturbances, he fell into his brother's hands, who threw him into prison, where he suffered the just punishment of his criminal enterprises.[1]

About the same time Goël placed a watch on John,[2] son of Stephen, who lived at Meulan, and seizing him as he was returning from a conference with the count his lord, who was then at Beaumont, in Normandy, he kept the avaricious usurer nearly four months in close prison. The count made earnest efforts for the liberation of his burgess, who was extremely rich, but he could not draw him out of the fox's mouth without the good offices of several lords. The politic count Robert, therefore concluded a peace with William, count of Evreux, betrothing his daughter Emma, then only a year old,[3] to William's nephew Amauri. Ralph de Conches, Eustace, and Goël, and other belligerent lord marchers were included in this pacification. In consequence John was set at liberty, and peace and security were restored to many others.

They ear following[4] Isabel, the wife of the earl of Mellent, gave birth to twins, who were named Walter and Robert, and from some impediments which occurred, Amauri was prevented from espousing the child he had been promised.

[1] As we have already remarked, this nobleman belonged to the illustrious house of Grancei, which derived its name from Grancei-le-Châtel, Côte-d'Or, in Burgundy. His wife's name was Agnes.

[2] A rich burgess of Meulan.

[3] Adeline de Meulan, who married Hugh, lord of Montfort-sur-Risle.

[4] In 1104.

CH. VII. *Duke Robert makes peace with Robert de Belèsme —The bishop and abbot of Séez take refuge in England from Belèsme's tyranny—The abbot becomes bishop of Rochester, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury.*

THE duke, abandoned to sloth, and perceiving the country laid waste, and that he was unable to defend the territories of his duchy against Robert de Belèsme, broke the engagement he had made with the king, and without his consent concluded peace with Robert, restoring to him his patrimonial estates, namely the bishopric of Séez, and other domains before mentioned. In consequence the venerable Serlo, bishop of Séez,[2] rather than submit to Robert's tyranny and live under his yoke, chose to retire from his bishopric. Abandoning his see, he became a wanderer in foreign countries, and excommunicated Robert and his adherents.

Robert de Belèsme also persecuted in various ways Ralph the abbot of Séez, a cheerful, facetious, and amiable person, and oppressing the vassals of St. Martin.[4] The Bishop, with iniquitous exactions, forced the abbot to secede by these unjust inflictions on his subjects. Thus both bishop and abbot, weary of the tyrant's yoke, took refuge in England, where they met a kind reception and comfort from King Henry.

About this time, the venerable Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, died, and abbot Ralph was appointed his successor by canonical election. He was consecrated bishop of Rochester, by Anselm, the reverend archbishop of Canterbury, and became some years afterwards his successor in that see.

CH. VIII. *Magnus Barfod's expedition to Ireland, in which he was slain—King Henry seizes his treasure at Lincoln—Relieved by his death from alarms in that quarter—Arnulph de Montgomery in Ireland.*

AT that time, Magnus, the powerful king of Norway, sailed round the British isles,[3] and landing on the islands as

[1] Serlo d'Orgères, near Gacé, the ex-abbot of St. Evroult. See vol. ii. p. 521, and the present vol. p. 30.

[2] Ralph d'Escures, abbot of St. Martin at Séez. Respecting this bishop, see vol. ii. p. 464.

[3] See the notes on Magnus Barfod's naval expeditions before, pp. 213, 216, 217. The opening of this chapter may apply to several of them, but

far as Ireland, prudently founded colonies in them, and commanded towns and villages to be constructed as in other countries. In consequence the Irish were extremely hostile to him, and did all in their power to oppose him, using every device to crush their enemy, either by force or fraud. Thereupon, the valiant king undertook an expedition against them, appearing with his fleet on the coast of Ireland. The Irish, struck with terror at the king's power, called on the Normans, and Arnulph,[1] and his auxiliaries hastened to bring them succour. But the united forces were awed by the presence of the formidable Magnus, and not daring to give him battle consulted how they might best manage to lead him into a snare by base treachery.

At last, some smooth-speaking men came to him with apparent amity, and enticed him on frivolous pretences to land from his ships and see the country, which they persuaded him he would be able to subdue with a small force. Magnus, too easily trusting the traitors, left his armed troops on the shore, and being conducted two miles by the traitors fell into the trap which cost him his life. For he found a large band of his enemies lying in ambush, who rushed on him from their place of concealment, and the daring Norwegian, disdaining to fly, encountered them bravely. But a handful of men could not withstand the attack of innumerable assailants. Magnus, setting his back against a tree, and covered by his shield, hurled his darts against the enemy, and wounded several of them, but, alas! he fell overwhelmed by numbers.[2]

A rich citizen of Lincoln kept the treasure of king Magnus, and supplied him with ornaments, plate, arms, furniture, and whatever else the royal service required. This man, having

Ordericus goes on to give some further details of the last in which the Norwegian king was slain in 1103.

[1] Arnulph de Montgomery being at this time governor or keeper of Pembroke castle, on Milford Haven, from which there has been easy communication with Ireland from the earliest times, the calling in of the Normans from that strong fortress was very natural. Strongbow's expedition afterwards embarked there for the conquest of Ireland.

[2] Magnus Barfod was slain in a sudden attack of the Irish in Ulster on St. Bartholomew's day, August 24, 1103, when he was on the point of re-embarking for Norway. His Saga in Snorro Sturleson's Heimskringla gives all the details in the vivid style of the Icelandic scalds.

learnt the king's death, hastened home, and trafficking with the king's treasure, speedily amassed vast wealth.[1]

Meanwhile, the king of England received the intelligence that Magnus was slain, with great satisfaction, feeling himself relieved from a great burden, and some time afterwards required the citizen of Lincoln to give up the late king's treasure. The merchant at first denied that he had any such deposit, but the king, having convicted him of the falshood, suddenly arrested him, and extorted from him, as it is said, more than twenty thousand pounds of silver.

The Irish, having tasted the blood of king Magnus and his followers, became still more savage, and made a sudden attempt to massacre the Normans. Their king also carried off his daughter, who was married to Arnulph, and contracted an illicit union for the wanton with one of his cousins, resolved to kill Arnulph himself, as the reward of his alliance; but the knight, discovering the execrable frauds of this barbarous people, made his escape to his countrymen, and lived for nearly twenty years afterwards without having any settled abode. At last, in his old age, having been reconciled with the king, to outward appearance at least, he married, and on the morrow of his nuptials fell asleep after a banquet, and shortly expiring, left the guests to listen to funeral dirges instead of an epithalamium.

King Henry grew stronger,[2] as his enemies on every side

[1] Our author supplies us in this paragraph with a short but curious notice of the mercantile connection which subsisted at that period between England and Norway. The Northmen had long been the greatest maritime power in Europe, and besides their trade by sea, had commercial relations with the east. Their merchants were settled in many of the great towns in England, and particularly in the "Five-Burghs," of which Lincoln, where this agent of Magnus Barfod is stated to have lived, was one. He was doubtless of Anglo-Norwegian origin, as almost all the free people of the north and east of England were. See Warsae's "Danes in England," pp. 104 and 152, and an Essay in the Jubilee edition of the Works of King Alfred.

[2] "I do not understand how the death of the king of Norway could so powerfully consolidate the throne of Henry I., but usurpers are surrounded by terrors; and, besides, there still existed great sympathy for the Norwegians in the north of England."—*Le Prevost.* The facts are that the free population of that part of the island was essentially composed of the descendants of the Northmen, the Anglo-Saxons having been exterminated or reduced to slavery; and their colonies and influence were also extended throughout the eastern and central districts in fifteen out of the thirty-two

yielded to the adverse issues of their variable fortunes, but his security was especially increased by the fall of King Magnus, and his resources were aggrandised, to his great satisfaction, by the royal treasure on which he had laid hands.

CH. IX. *Lewis of France at the court of King Henry—Intrigues of Queen Bertrade—Lewis escapes being poisoned—Succeeds Philip I.*

AT the same time, the young Lewis crossed over to England,[1] by his father's leave, with a retinue which though small was composed of men of ability. The illustrious youth came to the court of Henry as an aspirant in arms, and was received by him with the honours due to his royal birth, and treated with perfect good will under all circumstances. However, he was speedily followed by a messenger from his step-mother Bertrade, who was the bearer of despatches to King Henry under the seal of Philip, king of France. The king, who was a scholar,[2] read the letter, and after persuing it, hastily

counties of England. This hardy and independent race bowed reluctantly to the Norman yoke, and neither the Conqueror nor his sons were able fully to establish their power north of the Humber. Besides which, the kings of Norway had not forgotten that their ancestors once wore the English crown. The malcontents in England maintained intimate relations with their kinsmen in Scandinavia, and the kings were ready to take advantage of any opportunity of re-establishing their power, so that even so late as 1138 King Eric-Lam contemplated an invasion. Scarcely was Henry I. seated on the throne, when it was shaken by the northern rebellion, which it required all his talent and force of character to quell. Aware of this element in the political state of his kingdom, that sagacious prince might well exult at the death of so powerful and enterprising a king as Magnus Barfod, and we are indebted to our author for conveying to us the impression which it must have generally made at that period.

As to Henry's seizure of the Norwegian king's treasure at Lincoln, Magnus Barfod being at that time (as he has told us himself, before, p. 259,) at peace with England, the act was contrary to all principles of international law, but our Norman kings were not scrupulous in their confiscations and exactions, and Henry was as avaricious as most of his family.

[1] It was not at this time as our author states, but as early as Christmas in the year 1100, that the visit of the heir of the crown of France to the English court took place. The young prince was then twenty-three years of age.

[2] *Literatus rex.* We have not ventured to put a gloss on the phrase adopted by our author, as there seems to be some doubt respecting Henry's claims to be considered a man of letters in the modern sense of the words, notwithstanding his surname of *Beauclerc*. It is singular that neither Henry of Huntingdon nor William of Malmesbury, cotemporary writers,

summoned his council and had a long consultation on the affair. The purport of the letter, he had just read, was, that Philip, king of France, requested him to arrest his son, who had come over to the English court, and keep him in close confinement for the rest of his life. Henry, with his usual sagacity, ably discussed with his faithful barons the folly and indecency of the demand which the king of France had addressed to him through his queen's intrigues, and gave a flat refusal to a proposal altogether so abominable and unworthy of a king, and so repugnant to himself and his nobles.

William de Buschelai,[1] a knight of intelligence, who was in attendance on Lewis, discovered the affair while it was still a secret, and, in consequence, although he had not been summoned to the council, entered the apartment as if for amusement. The king immediately gave him a gracious message to Lewis, requesting him to retire quietly from his court; and sent him back to France, having loaded both the prince and his companions with munificent presents. Lewis, discovering his step-mother's perfidy, went to his father in great wrath, and informed him of the terrible calamity to which his letter had exposed him in a foreign country. The king, who knew nothing of the infamous treachery, denied the whole, and the young prince, boiling with rage, sought his step-mother's death; she however tried every means to be before him in the work of destruction, and, having sent for three wizards, who were of the number of the clergy, promised them a large sum of money to procure Lewis's death.[2] These miscreants performed their cursed sorceries for three days, and promised the cruel adulteress that Lewis would be a corpse in nine days more, if they continued their incantations. In the interval one of them revealed the

who have taken extended views of his character, the latter even describing his person, should be altogether silent on the subject of his literary attainments. Malmesbury, indeed, says incidentally that "he could not much read aloud," *quamvis ipse nec multum palam legeret*, which gives occasion to M. Le Prevost to remark that it must have given him some trouble to peruse the French king's letter.

[1] William de Buchelai, near Mantes, one of the most devoted servants of Lewis-le-Gros.

[2] Bertrade's infamous attempts on the liberty, and then on the life of her step-son, are quite in character with her previous history. See before, pp. 3, 4.

jugglery of his fellows, and they were both arrested, so that, by God's mercy, their machinations were incomplete. Then the audacious step-mother had recourse to dealers in poison, and induced them, by promises of great rewards, to administer it to the king's son. In consequence, the illustrious youth took to his bed, and for many days could neither eat nor sleep. Almost all the French were in despair at the danger to which the lawful heir to the crown was exposed. At last, all remedies adminstered by the French physicians having failed, a man from Barbary,[1] with a long beard,[2] presented himself, and applied the experience of his medical skill to the desperate case of the young prince, and by God's help succeeded, in spite of the jealous interference of the native physicians. This person had long resided among the infidels, where he had studied under masters deeply versed in the secrets of physical science, who had become eminent among the wisest of the barbarians for their knowledge acquired by the patient investigation of philosophical truth. The royal youth recovered at last, but he was pale to the day of his death.[3]

Bertrade was in despair at her step-son's being restored to health. Fear of the consequences of the injury she had tried to do him produced hatred, which became daily on the increase. Sparing no efforts to accomplish her anxiety for his destruction, she engaged many partners in her iniquity, that, released from all fear of the young prince she had so much offended, the government might fall into her own hands, and on his death she might be better able to place her own sons, Philip[4] and Florus[5] on the throne. However, the king humbly implored his son's forgiveness of his

[1] *Barbarie.* Probably not Barbary in Africa, but the country occupied by the African Moors in Spain, where there were at this period very flourishing schools of medicine, the Arab races furnishing, as is well known, physicians and writers on that science, far in advance of the Christians.

[2] *Hirsutus.* Our author loses no opportunity of marking the horror felt by the clergy of that age for long hair and long beards.

[3] Notwithstanding his corpulence, Lewis continued pale all his life in consequence of the poisons administered to him by Bertrade's means.

[4] Philip, count of Mantes and lord of Mehun-sur-Iévre, married in 1104 Elizabeth, daughter of Gui Troussel, lord of Montlhéri, one of the *Funambules* of Antioch. See before p. 129.

[5] Fleuri married the heiress of Nangis, by whom he had Elizabeth de Nangis, wife of Ansel de Venisi.

criminal step-mother, promising amendment on her behalf, and ceding to him Pontoise and all the Vexin, as the price of his reconciliation. Lewis, after consulting the bishops and barons, who he knew were devoted to him, and out of respect for his father's dignity, pardoned the offence. Bertrade trembled at his frown, now that she found her wickedness was discovered, and, covered with shame, humbled herself to become his handmaid, and thenceforth, though reluctantly, abstained from further attempts on the life against which she had so much practised.

Lewis succeeded to the throne of France five years afterwards, on his father's death, and reigned twenty-seven years.[1] He always esteemed Henry, the king of England, who had been so true to him as before related, and never had any disputes with him, but against his own inclination, and through the intrigues of mischievous traitors.

CH. X. *King Henry crosses over to Normandy with a powerful armament—Norman barons, his adherents—Conference with Duke Robert—The country of Lisieux ceded to the king.*

RALPH DE CONCHES crosed over the sea after his father's death, and received a gracious reception from the king, who confirmed him in his father's English honours and estates. He married Adeliza, the daughter of Earl Waltheof and Judith, the king's cousin,[2] who bore him Roger and Hugh, besides several daughters. Many other lords, who were men of spirit, thus deserted the spiritless duke, and prudently attached themselves to the sagacious king, imploring him

[1] "From the 3rd of August, 1108, the day of his coronation, to the 1st of August, 1137 (?) which makes twenty-nine years instead of twenty-seven." —*Le Prevost.* This prince has the same character for gormandizing given him by Henry of Huntingdon as his father. "Whose god," he says "was their belly, and indeed a fatal enemy it was; for such was their gluttony that they became so fat as not to be able to support themselves. Philip died long ago of plethora; Lewis has now shared the same fate, though a young man."—*Letter to Walter,* in Henry of Huntingdon's works, *Antiq. Lib.* p. 313, and see preface p. xii., where it is shown that the letter to Walter was written in 1135, which, connected with the assertion that Lewis was then dead, confirms the computation of Ordericus.

[2] Adeliza, daughter of Earl Waltheof and Judith, daughter of the countess of Aumale, sister of William the Conqueror. We shall find in the year 1134, Roger de Toëni, the eldest of their children.

with tears in their eyes to succour the suffering church of God, and their wretched country. Henry was therefore gently entreated, or rather earnestly petitioned, by many honourable persons, both of the clergy and laity, to visit the heritage of his ancestors, which was miserably desolated, and, cheering by his presence a country which had no governor, take posession of it, and defend it against abandoned robbers by bringing them to justice.

In the year of our Lord 1104, Henry, king of England, sailed over to Normandy with a powerful fleet, and visited Domfront, and the other castles which were under his dominion,[1] in great state. He was received honourably by his principal vassals who made him large presents, fitting a king. Robert earl of Mellent, and Richard of Chester, Stephen earl of Aumale, and Henry count d'Eu, Rotrou count de Mortain, Eustace of Boulogne, Ralph de Conches, Robert Fitz-Hamon, Robert de Montfort, and Ralph de Mortemer, with several others, held many lordships under him in England, and having espoused his cause in Normandy with their vassals, were ready to have recourse to arms and support it zealously against all the world. In a few days he summoned his brother to a conference and accused him, in the presence of his parasites, with having broken the treaty they had concluded in England, by making peace without his consent with Robert de Belèsme, who was a traitor to them both, restoring to him, contrary to law and justice, the fiefs held by his father. Henry further reproached the duke with having by his indolence abetted[2] thieves, robbers, and other malefactors; and having hopelessly abandoned Normandy to the shameless bullies by whom he was enslaved, and with filling the office of shepherd and prince to no purpose, while he did not exercise the powers of government for the benefit of the church of God and the defenceless people, instead of leaving them to the tender mercies of their persecutors, like sheep in the jaws of wolves. The king stated his case with great reason and ability, asserting that the

[1] This passage shows with what regard to the faith of treaties Henry had observed the stipulation in that of 1101, by which Domfront was the only castle he reserved in Normandy. See before p. 285.

[2] *Deserviret.* Duchesne's reading is *deseruerit*, which must be a mistake.

duke had broken the treaty made between the two brothers in many important particulars which he could not deny, but excused himself by throwing the blame on his contemptible associates. In fact he was equally destitute of judgment and friends, making light of the society and counsels of good and wise men, and miserably following an opposite course, to the detriment of his people as well as himself. In the present embarrased state of his affairs, having advised with those about him, he implored, as was natural, for the weaker of the two brothers, the favour of the stronger, and gave up to him William count of Evreux,[1] with his county and all his vassals; for both Robert and his adherents were alarmed lest they should be brought to public trial, and the duke be justly deprived of the duchy which he nominally, not really, governed, or should have to sustain a formidable war against his royal brother, to his utter destruction.

The illustrious count [of Evreux], hearing that he was to be transferred like a horse or an ox, and wishing to preserve his integrity and fealty, said publicly to the princes: "I have served your father faithfully all my days, never having stained my sworn fealty in any matter hitherto; I have also observed it to his heir, and determined to use every effort to continue in the same. But it being impossible, as I have often heard learned doctors quote from the scripture, and God himself has declared in the gospel, for any one to serve in peace two masters who disagree with each other, it is my earnest desire to be subject to only one lord, lest being liable to a double service, I shall satisfy neither of them. I love both the king and the duke; both are the sons of the king my lord, and I wish to respect both; but I will only do homage to one of them, and him I will loyally serve as my lord." This candid declaration pleased every one.

The duke Robert himself placed the count's hand in the king's; and peace being restored between the brothers, Henry returned to England before winter. Soon however,

[1] William, who was at the battle of Hastings, became count of Evreux on the death of his father, which happened on the 13th of October, 1067, and died himself the 18th of April, 1118. He was grandson of Archbishop Robert, and consequently cousin, one degree removed, from William the Conqueror.

the fierce freebooters renewed their hostile excursions, and quickly overturned all that the king and great men had ordered for the good of the country. For Robert de Belèsme was greatly disturbed at the advantages the king, whom he cordially hated, had obtained by his journey, and in concert with his nephew, William, earl of Morton,[1] and such others as he was able to seduce, commenced hostilities against the king's adherents. In consequence, the evil disposed subjects in that district were guilty of greater excesses than I can describe. They presently stained the whole province with murder and robbery, and, carrying off their booty and putting the inhabitants to death, set fire to the houses. The country people with their wives and children fled into France, where they suffered greatly in their exile. Thus the Normans, who boasted of being the conquerors of the English and Apulians on their native soil, were now reduced to labour in misery and sorrow on the fields of France. Meanwhile, their own gardens, left deserted, were overrun with thistles and nettles, which covered the ground, for want of cultivation.

CH. XI. *The bishop of Séez officiates in presence of King Henry at Carentan—The bishop's discourse on the miseries of the country and the evil fashions of the age — He crops the long hair of Henry and his courtiers.*

AMIDST these calamities, holy church was grievously persecuted; and while she frequently witnessed the deaths of her

[1] William, earl of Morton, cousin-german of Robert Curthose and Henry I.

Our author has omitted to mention the grounds of the animosity which subsisted between the king and the earl of Morton. It appears that their mutual hatred was of old date, but it broke out in consequence of the demand made by William to the investiture of the earldom of Kent, to which he founded his pretensions on a devise by his uncle Bishop Odo. He was a young nobleman of a most active disposition, and as much distinguished for ability as his father was for want of talent, from whom he inherited the earldom of Cornwall. Indignant at the refusal he received from King Henry, and the forfeiture of his earldom of Cornwall in 1104, he retired to Normandy, where, guided by the counsels of Robert de Belèsme, his uncle, he became one of the king's most dangerous enemies. He also entertained great antipathy towards the young Richard, earl of Chester, his neighbour in Normandy, who, being a minor, was placed by the king under his guardianship, *nonnulla partibus ejus appenditia invasit, carpsit,*

innocent children, and the irreparable loss of lives, pure hands were lifted to heaven with heart-felt prayers to her Spouse, who rules above, to afford her relief. Cries of distress from suffering Normandy were wafted across the channel, and the complaints of the desolate people of Normandy were addressed to the king of England. Gunhier d'Aunai,[1] who had the custody of Bayeux, and Reynold de Warrenne,[2] who espoused the cause of the duke, with his other partizans, broke the treaty of peace, and, making prisoners Robert Fitz-Hamon[3] and some other of the king's adherents, detained them long in prison, both to extort heavy ransoms and to show their contempt and hatred of the king.[4] In consequence, the vigilant monarch no sooner heard

abrasit. He was exposed to horrible and long-continued cruelties, after falling into Henry's hands at the battle of Tinchebrai.

[1] Gontier de Launai, or d'Aunai, nephew of Hugh de Nonant. There are two places of the name of Launai, and seven with that of Aunai in Normandy. Probably this was Aunai-le-Bois, in the canton of Mesle-sur-Sarthe, or Notre Dame-d'Aunai, near Sap, both not far from Nonant.

[2] Reynold de Warrenne, brother of the earl of Surrey.

[3] Grandson of Hamon-aux-Dents, lord of Torigni, Creuilli, and other vast domains, who was killed at the battle of Valesdunes. It has already appeared, vol. ii. p. 473, that he married Sibylla de Montgomery.

[4] This happened in the commencement of the year 1105. Robert Fitz-Hamon was surprised by troops from Bayeux and Caen, placed in ambush at Sicqueville in Bessin, while he was overrunning the country to reduce it to submission to the king of England. He took refuge in the church tower, but his assailants set it on fire, and he was obliged to come down and surrender. While they were conducting him to Bayeux, his guard kept shouting in his ear (as Wace tells us, who supplies these details, t. ii. p. 392)—

La hart, la hart al traitor,
Ki a guerpi son dreit seignor!

However justly merited these imprecations, they were probably lost upon him, as he received a contusion on the brain, while defending himself in the church tower, which deprived him of his reason for the rest of his life, prolonged till March, 1107. This circumstance was regarded as a sign of the divine wrath, not at Robert Fitzhamon's rebellion against his lawful sovereign, but for the disasters occasioned by his captivity, such as the pillage of Bayeux and the burning of the cathedral. It might be remarked that they happened after the accident which deprived Robert of his reason; but the historian himself adds that the impression is erroneous, as the king repaired the injuries received by the cathedral of Bayeux with great magnificence, and Robert Fitz-Hamon founded an abbey at Tewkesbury, distinguished both for its noble architecture, and the worth of its monks. See *Monast. Anglic.* vol. i. p. 153.

these occurrences, than he gave orders to fit out a fleet. Crossing over to Normandy the spring following, he landed at the port called Barbaflot, in the last week of Lent,[1] and on Easter eve,[2] found quarters in the village of Carentan, on the fords of the Vire, where he rested for a while.

Serlo, the venerable bishop of Séez, met him there, being the first of the Normans who offered their services to King Henry; and undertook the celebration of the Paschal solemnities in honour of the King of kings. Entering the church in company with Henry, and being robed in his sacred vestments in readiness to commence the holy office, while waiting patiently the assembling of the people and the royal household, he observed that the church was encumbered with the chests of the villagers, and a quantity of implements and furniture of various kinds. Drawing a deep sigh, he thus poured forth his grief to the king, who had humbly seated himself with some of his nobles among the peasants' paniers[3] at the lower end of the church: "The hearts of the faithful may well be afflicted on observing the humiliation of the church and the sufferings of the unhappy people. The spectacle exhibited in this church shows the desolation to which the Cotentin is subjected. In truth, the whole of Normandy is a prey to irreligious freebooters, for want of a fitting ruler. The church of God, which was once called the house of prayer, is now, as you see, indecently filled with this vile lumber; and the edifice which ought to be set apart for the sole purpose of celebrating the divine sacraments, is, for want of a just protector, become the storehouse of the people. It is impossible for the congregation to bend their knees with due reverence before the altar, nor even stand as they should with ease and devotion in presence of the Divine Majesty, on account of the heaps of goods which the defenceless peasants have collected in this house of God, to save them, in their alarm, from the sons of violence. The church is thus made the people's stronghold, but even there perfect security is not found. This very year, Robert

[1] Barfleur. Holy-Week.
[2] Holy Saturday, the 8th of April.
[3] *Cistas.* M. Le Prevost considers that the large round baskets suspended by the peasants on the sides of their pack-horses, are meant.

de Belèsme set fire to the church of Tournai in my diocese,[1] destroying in it forty-five persons of both sexes. I relate this, overwhelmed with sorrow, in the presence of God; I tell it in your ears, my lord king, to inflame your heart with holy zeal, that you may strive to imitate Phineas,[2] Mattathias[3] and his sons. Rouse yourself to action in the name of the Lord, and with the sword of justice make yourself master of your father's inheritance, and recover the territory of your ancestors and the people of God from the dominion of abandoned men. Your brother Robert is not really in possession of Normandy, and does not govern his subjects as a duke who ought to guide them in the path of justice, but, abandoned to sloth, is subservient to William de Conversana, Hugh de Nonant, the governor of Rouen, Gunhier, his nephew, and other worthless men. Alas! he dissipates in trivial follies the wealth of his noble duchy, while he often fasts till nones[4] for want of bread. The greatest part of his time he lies in bed, and is prevented from going to church, because such is his want of clothes, that he has neither trowsers, stockings, or shoes. The buffoons and harlots, by whom he is constantly surrounded, carry off his clothes during the night, while he is drunk and snoring, and boast with derision that they have robbed the duke. Thus, the head being sick, the whole body faints, and the prince being weak, the entire country is in peril, and the wretched people are exposed to all sorts of calamities. From the time of Rollo, the first of the Normans who ruled in Normandy, from whom you derive your descent, till this weak prince, Normandy has been governed by powerful dukes. In this affliction of your native land, brave king, 'be angry,' as David, the king and prophet, says, 'and sin not;'[5] inasmuch as you take arms for the defence of your country, and not from ambition to extend your territorial power."

This discourse of the bishop so inflamed the king's ardour, that, having consulted with the nobles who were

[1] Tournai-sur-Dive, in the canton of Trun.

[2] Numb. xxv. 7, 8.

[3] Macab. ii. 24.

[4] Three o'clock p.m.

[5] The two words, *noli peccare*, may have been borrowed from Ps. iv. 5; but it would rather appear that the quotation our author puts into the bishop's mouth, is not from the psalmist, but from St. Paul, Ephes. iv. 26.

present, he thus spoke: "In God's name, I will not shrink from toiling earnestly for the restoration of peace, and with your aid will use my best endeavours to give tranquillity to the church."

The earl of Mellent supported this resolution, and none of the nobles present dissented from it, but, on the contrary, joined in earnestly entreating their common father to commence hostilities with vigour for the general defence of Normandy against those who were ruining the people.

The eloquent prelate resumed his sacred discourse, and, with salutary zeal in his holy office, added: "It is our daily duty to persevere in discovering the way of life, and to obey in all things the divine law, which is infallible. Although we cannot correct all the crimes which are wrought in secret, at least we should strike with the sword of the Spirit those which are openly committed against God, and the offenders should be cut off from amongst us in every way, according to the commandments of God and the decrees of the holy fathers. You all wear long hair, in female fashion, a thing which is unbecoming in you who are made in the image of God, and ought to exhibit manly strength. The apostle Paul, the elect vessel, and doctor of the Gentiles, points out to the Corinthians how indecent and odious it is for men to wear long hair, saying: 'A man ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man.' And a little afterwards, he adds: 'If a man have long hair it is a shame unto him; but if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her, for her hair is given her for a covering.'[1]

"It is not for their ornament or pleasure that penitents are enjoined not to shave their beards or cut their hair; but that, as their sins make them appear inwardly rough and unseemly in the sight of God, so they may in their exterior exhibit themselves before men unshaven and unshorn, and mark the deformity of the inner man by their outward ignominy. By their long beards they make themselves like goats, whose filthy lasciviousness is shamefully imitated by fornicators and sodomites, while good men justly treat them with abhorrence on account of the odious foulness of their lusts. As for those who nourish their hair, they are con-

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 7, 14, 15.

sidered as fit associates of the women by whose blandishments they are seduced from manly virtue to evil courses, and very often involved in the wretchedness of a detestable apostacy. Alas! see how the salutary medicine which the doctors of the church, who are spiritual physicians, heretofore provided, by Divine inspiration, for the cure of souls, has been used by the sons of perdition, at Satan's instigation, to fill up the measure of their condemnation, and who by long use have established the custom. The popes of Rome and other bishops have prohibited this rash innovation, and condemned it in their counsels by divine authority, but the hardened sinners persist in their evil follies, and oppose the shield of their wickedness to the sword of holy preaching. They suffer their beards to grow for fear that if they shaved, the short bristles might prick the faces of their mistresses when they were kissing them, and are so hairy that they look like Turks rather than Christians. Thus the personal neglect which is the mark of penitence is converted into a token of wantonness! In short these froward sons of Beliai dress their hair like women, while they wear things like scorpions' tails at the extremities of their feet, thus exhibiting themselves as women by their effeminacy, and serpents by their pointed fangs. This kind of men were foretold a thousand years ago by St. John the mystic, under the figure of locusts, and he has plainly foreshadowed them in the Apocalypse, written in the isle of Pathmoth.[1] Many persons adopt this perverted practice from ignorance that there can be so much mischief in the fashion of wearing the hair in which they glory.[2] For this reason, I beseech you, most illustrious king, to set your subjects a laudable example, that they may see in your person, above all others, how they ought to adjust their own." [3]

[1] Another example of the use of the aspirated *t* or *th*, mentioned before p. 221.

[2] Our author has already put on record the complaints of the clergy at the new fashions of the day, in much the same terms which are employed in the bishop's discourse. See vol. ii. pp. 477, 478.

[3] Not only fashions, but religious peculiarities, have their cycles. Such a scene as that so vividly described by Ordericus might very possibly have occurred five centuries later; Charles II. and his cavaliers taking the place of Henry I. and his barons, and some puritan minister, the prejudices of whose party it was desirable to conciliate, filling, both in word and act, the

The king and all his nobles cheerfully assented to these observations, upon which the zealous bishop lost no time in taking a pair of scissors out of his scrip, with which he first cropped the king's hair with his own hands, and then that of the count[1] and several of his nobles. All the royal household and the rest of the congregation contended with each other who should be cropped first, and, anticipating in alarm an order from the king, severed the locks which were before so precious, trampling under foot, like vile refuse, what once they dearly cherished.

After having celebrated the feast of Easter, the king of England sent envoys to Philip, king of France, and summoning Geoffrey Martel, count of Anjou, proceeded to take summary vengeance on the enemies of the church of God.[2]

office assigned to the zealous bishop of Séez. Notwithstanding the docility with which the king and his courtiers submitted ther heads to the bishop's scissors, the fashion of wearing long hair survived the operation, to the great scandal of the clergy.

In 1129, an English knight, who, like all men of fashion, wore long hair like women, had a dream, in which some one appeared to strangle him in his own curls. The knight woke in such alarm that he lost no time in getting rid of the superfluous ornament of his head, and his example was followed by almost all the other knights, but in the course of a year, all who affected the manners of the court re-adopted the prevailing fashion.

[1] The earl of Mellent. He is supposed to have contrived the first part of the somewhat theatrical exhibition in the church of Carentan, in which the king and the bishop were assigned their respective parts; but he can hardly be suspected of being in the secret of the denouement. The earl was the most accomplished gentleman of the age, and all men of fashion took him for their model, not only in dress, but in their phraseology, and even in the hour at which their tables were served. In imitation and by the advice of the emperor Alexius Comnenus, he took only one repast in the course of the day; and there seems no doubt that he introduced that practice, instead of the four plentiful meals, the boast of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, which Robert du Mont so keenly regrets. Henry of Huntingdon says of King Hardecanute, "Such was his liberality that tables were laid four times a-day with royal sumptuousness for his whole court. . . . . In our time (1090—1154) it is the custom, whether from parsimony, or as they themselves say, from fastidiousness, for princes to provide only one meal a-day for their court."—*Antiq. Lib.* p. 201.

[2] Geoffrey Martel, who was killed the year following at the siege of the castle of Condé on the 18th of May, was not, in fact, count of Anjou, but eldest son and presumptive heir of that nobleman, who, however, outlived him. Still it appears that he assumed the title with the administration of affairs after he had delivered his uncle Geoffrey-le-Barbu from captivity in 1096, when the rights of the latter were ceded to Geoffrey Martel, with the consent of his father, Fulk-le-Réchin.

Ch. XII. *Appearance of a comet—Bohemond's visit to France—Pilgrimage to St. Leonard's tomb—Marriage with Constance, King Philip's daughter.*

In the year of our Lord 1106, the world saw a variety of revolutions in the fortunes of princes, and there were several memorable occurrences in various quarters. In the last week of February, an extraordinary comet appeared in the west, which extending its long tail far in the east, struck terror into the hearts of the multitude, and its brightness in the evenings, during three weeks, caused the revelation of many secrets.[1]

In the month of March, Duke Bohemond came to France, in fulfilment of the vow he made to God while he was Dalimán's captive, and solemnly accomplished his vow at the tomb of St. Leonard-the-confessor, in the Limousin.[2] Previous to his arrival in France, he had despatched messengers to England to inform the king of the reason of his journey to Italy, and of his desire to cross the sea and visit his court. The prudent king, however, apprehensive that Bohemond might induce some of his best knights to leave his service, sent him word not to risk the danger of a voyage in the winter, more especially as it was his own intention to pass over to Normandy before the celebration of Easter, and

[1] "On Friday in the first week of Lent, the sixteenth of the calends of March (February 14), a strange star appeared in the evening, and was seen at the same hour for fourteen days in the south-western quarter of the heavens. The body was small and hazy, but the light which shot from it was of extraordinary brilliance, and it reflected a meteoric brightness from the east and north. Florence of Worcester, p. 652. As to this meteor, see *L'Histoire des Comètes*, t. i. p. 526.

Ordericus has fallen into an error in fixing its first appearance in the last week of February. Although some authors have connected the phenomenon with the year 1105, the great bulk of testimony favours the date of 1106, and the circumstantial detail of Friday, 16th of February, furnished by Florence of Worcester, leaves no doubt that the computation generally adopted is the right one, and Ordericus agrees with it.

[2] Our author has already mentioned this journey of Bohemond (vol. ii. p. 223) as well as the appearance of the comet which preceded it, and which is supposed to have been the same as that seen in 1680. The object of Bohemond's pilgrimage was St. Leonard-le-Noblac, five leagues from Limoges. His arrival in France did not take place in the month of March, 1106, as Ordericus states, but towards the close of 1105, and he left it in the spring of 1107.

they would have an opportunity of conferring together while he was there; and so it happened.

In consequence, Bohemond having performed his devotions and left Noblac,[1] where the tomb of the excellent confessor stands, spent the season of Lent in visiting several cities and castles in France, and being received in all quarters both by the clergy and people with great respect, he related the various events in which he had taken part. He reverently offered on the holy altars, relics; and mantles made entirely of silk, and other precious objects, and, delighting in the attentions paid him in the monasteries and bishops' seats, returned thanks to God for the welcome given him by the people of the West. He was accompanied by the son of the Emperor Diogenes,[2] and other eminent men from Greece and Thrace, whose accusation of the emperor Alexius for his treasonable usurpation of their hereditary throne roused the fury of the fierce Franks against him. Many persons of noble birth came and presented their infant children to him, whom he kindly held at the holy font in baptism, and gave them his own name. His own baptismal name was Mark, but his father, having heard the story of the giant Bohemond[3] in the merriment of a convivial meeting, jocularly called his son by the giant's name. It was afterwards spread throughout the world, and in the mouths of numbers in the three climates of the globe. From thenceforth this name, which was seldom adopted before among the nations of the West, became popular in France.

The hero of whom we are speaking had an interview with

[1] *Noblac*, a surname added by the saint. He called it *Nobiliacus*, a noble domain, because it was granted to him by royal munificence. There are a number of places in the Limousin and other parts of France which have derived their names from some such circumstance, as Neuillé, of which there are two, Neuilli, twenty-five; Noaillac, or Nouilhac, three; Noailles, three, &c.

[2] Ordericus means the impostor patronised by Bohemond and his father under the name of Michael Parapinaces to give a colour to their enterprises against Alexius Comnenus. See vol. ii. p. 355. His pretensions were generally exploded at the time our author lived.

[3] We are not aware of any other record of popular traditions respecting this character, who appears to have played the same part as the Gargantua of later times. Perhaps the fables of which he was the hero, were peculiar to the south of Italy and never crossed the mountains.

King Philip, and demanded the hand of his daughter Constance in marriage. At last, after Easter, he espoused her at Chartres, the countess Adela providing a sumptuous banquet for all who attended the wedding. The king of France himself was present with a great retinue, and gave Bohemond his daughter, having divorced her from Hugh, count of Troyes, for some reason which has escaped my observation.[1] Then the duke, distinguished among the most illustrious, proceeded to the church, and standing on the steps before the altar of the Virgin Mother, related to the vast assembled multitude his adventures and achievements, exhorting all who were brought up to arms to join him in his enterprise against the emperor, and promising cities and opulent towns to knights of approved courage. In consequence, numbers assumed the cross with ardour, and leaving all they possessed, embraced the pilgrimage to Jerusalem as if they were going to a feast. Among them were Ralph de Pont-Echaufré, surnamed the Red, and Josceline, his brother, Simon d'Anet, Robert de Maule, Hugh Sans-Avoir, his cousin,[2] with several others whose names I cannot individually mention.

Ch. XIII. *A miraculous occurrence to Robert d'Estoteville—He is killed in battle soon afterwards.*

The same year the following occurrence happened in Normandy. Robert d'Estoteville,[3] a brave and powerful baron, was a strong partisan of the duke, and superintended his

[1] Our author has mentioned this marriage before. The first union of Constance was dissolved on account of consanguinity. Ordericus is right in fixing the marriage of Bohemond and Constance of France in 1106.

[2] Ralph and Josceline of Pont-Echaufré, near Bernai; Simon of Anet, near Dreux; Robert de Maule, son of William, and nephew of Ansold de Maule, mentioned before (vol. ii. p. 224), Hugh Sans-Avoir, of a family which had already supplied several crusaders.

Ralph and Josceline were with their eldest brother William, sons of Josceline de Pont-Échaufré and Heremburge Giroie. See vol. i. p. 395. Ralph will appear again in book xii., generally with his surname of Ralph-the-Red. William seems to have joined early his countrymen in the south of Italy. It is probable that Josceline never returned from the crusade.

[3] Robert d'Estoteville, second of that name, was son of Robert I. and brother-in-law of Hugh de Grantmesnil.

troops and fortresses in the district of Caux. It chanced on Easter-day,[1] as his chaplain was communicating the baron and his household, that a certain knight having approached the altar for the purpose of reverently receiving the eucharist, the priest took the consecrated wafer in his hand for the purpose of putting it into the communicant's open mouth, but found that he was quite unable to lift his hand from the altar. In this dilemma, both parties were extremely terrified; but at length the priest said to the knight: "Take it, if you can; for myself, it is out of my power to move my hand and deliver the Lord's body to you." Upon this the knight stretched his neck over the altar, with some effort reached the chalice, and received the host in his open mouth from the priest's hand. This extraordinary occurrence covered him with confusion, and not knowing what would happen, he was apprehensive of some misfortune, and in consequence distributed among the clergy and the poor the greatest part of his wardrobe and other effects. He fell soon after Easter in the first battle fought at Maromme[2] near Rouen. The chaplain, whose name was Robert, related to me what happened to him and the unfortunate knight, as I have related, during the celebration of the life-giving mysteries.

CH. XIV. *One Robert, simoniacally appointed abbot of Dive, builds a fortress within the abbey precincts.*

THEN Fulk, abbot of Dive, died at Winchester in England, on the third of the nones [the 3rd] of April,[3] and a miserable creature of the name of Robert procured himself to be intruded into the office by paying the duke one hundred and forty silver marks. This man, who had made his profession as a monk of St. Denys, caused the dispersion of the Lord's flock, instead of being its pastor, becoming generally odious as a true follower of Simon Magus. The monks

[1] The 9th of April, 1105.

[2] Maromme, near Rouen. Its original name was *Matrona*, borrowed probably from the river which waters it.

[3] Fulk, abbot of St. Pierre-sur-Dive, the strict disciplinarian, had resumed his authority six years before. See vol. ii. p. 207, and the present vol. p. 107. His death ought to be referred to the 3rd of April, 1105, not 1106.

therefore fled from him as from the presence of a devouring wolf, and anxious for the safety of their souls, dispersed themselves among other convents. The abbot built a castle on the banks of the Dive within the abbey walls, turning the house of God into a den of thieves. He also sold the ecclesiastical ornaments which the zeal of the faithful had furnished, and this simoniacal castellan used the money to pay his retainers.[1]

CH. XV. *France visited with a contagious disorder in the summer and autumn of the year* 1105.

IN the month of May a contagious influenza spread through all the West, and the catarrh becoming very severe, every eye wept, and in France where I was at that time,[2] all cheeks were bedewed with tears. The unusual heat of the summer prematurely ripened the corn, and an autumn of the same weather succeeded. Burning fever and other febrile diseases with a variety of disorders grievously afflicted mankind, and prostrated numbers who took to their beds.

CH. XVI. *Premature death of Geoffrey Martel—The succession to the county of Anjou.*

THE same month, Geoffrey Martel, count of Anjou, laid siege to Normand-de-Montreuil in the castle of Cande, and vigorously assaulted it.[3] This prince executed justice with firmness and courage, wielding the rod of discipline over the backs of thieves and robbers with great severity, although his father had been in the habit of sparing them, and often enjoying the fruits of their pillage, portions of which were appropriated to him. When Geoffrey first arrived at manhood and witnessed the great iniquity which was wrought, with his father's infamous connivance, in the province of

[1] We shall find presently that this miserable simonist possessed the abbey only fifteen months.

[2] Probably at Orleans, his father's native place, or at Maule, of which he has given us so particular an account, vol. ii. p. 216, &c.

[3] *Condatum.* Modern historians call this castle Lande, and say that it stood at the mouth of the Vienne. They call the lord against whom the expedition was undertaken, Normand de Montreuil. M. Le Prevost thinks that for Montreuil should be substituted Montrevault, near Beaufreau, and for Lande, Candé, which is, in truth, the Condate Turonum of the Romans.

Anjou, inspired by divine zeal, he lamented the miseries of his country which, in the enjoyment of peace, would have abounded with everything good.

At length, by order of his uncle Geoffrey, who was the lawful heir (but who had been, though the perjury of Fulk, deprived of his county and imprisoned for nearly thirty years in the castle Chinon, from whence he with difficulty escaped in the presence and by the order of the venerable Pope Urban), his father also consenting, Geoffrey Martel undertook the government of the county of Anjou, and used every effort to do justice to the simple people and the poor, and laudably gave security to the church. By God's help, he quickly restored peace throughout the province, and gloriously surpassed all his predecessors in courage and equity: his career was soon ended, but he accomplished much in a short time.

Three years after he undertook the government, Geoffrey Martel, as I before stated, laid siege to Candé, and gallantly pressed the rebels shut up in the fortress with the force of his arms. The chiefs of the garrison had come out to treat of concluding peace with him and surrendering the place to him on the following day, when, suddenly, a cross-bow man, instigated by the devil, levelled a bolt from the castle and shot the brave young prince while he was holding a conference with the chiefs, mortally wounding that excellent guardian of justice in the arm. The legitimate defender of his country died on the morrow, and was buried with general lamentations in the abbey church of St. Nicholas, bishop of Myra.[1]

On his death, Philip, king of France, invested his step-son Fulk[2] in the county of Anjou, but as he was a minor, the king appointed William, duke of Poitiers,[3] who happened to be then at court, his guardian to protect him during his journey

[1] This sad catastrophe happened on Friday, the 18th of May, 1106. The abbey of St. Nicholas d'Angers was founded in 1020, by Fulk Nerra, in the suburbs of Angers on the right bank of the Maine.

[2] Fulk, fifth of that name, son of Bertrade de Montfort, was afterwards count of Anjou and king of Jerusalem. Our author seems to intimate in this passage that Fulk was put into immediate possession of Anjou, whereas he was only acknowledged as heir to it in reversion of his father.

[3] William, seventh of the name, count de Poitiers, the same who had recently returned from the Holy Land with little glory.

and conduct him in safety to his father. The duke, having led him as far as the frontier of his own territories, there arrested him, regardless of his duty and the account he would have to give, and kept him in confinement for more than a year. The plethoric king of France,[1] being informed of this outrage, was greatly displeased, and employed both entreaties and menaces to procure the liberation of the young count.[2] Bertrade, his mother, being the king's wife, used all her influence with him, and urged many others, to effect the rescue of the captive, to no purpose. At length the king, stimulated by frequent solicitations, threatened severe vengeance for the outrage. But the haughty duke, despising the king because of his corpulence, detained the young count for some time, until his father surrendered for his son's ransom some castles on the confines of the two counties. The father died soon afterwards, at an advanced age, and the young count married Eremburga, daughter of Elias, count of Maine, who bore him a noble family of both sexes.

Ch. XVII. *King Henry's troops reduce and burn Bayeux—Caen surrenders, he is repulsed from Falaise, and returns to England.*

In the spring of the same year,[3] as it has been already stated, King Henry sailed over to Normandy, and asserted his rights to the inheritance of his father which was trodden under foot by perjurers, robbers, and bullies. Employing Elias count of Maine and his troops, he besieged Bayeux which was held by Gunhier d'Aunai. That knight came forth to the king, and out of regard to him liberated without ransom Robert Fits-Hamon, whom he had before taken prisoner, but he gave a flat refusal to Henry's imperious demands for the surrender of the place. The king thereupon immediately issued orders for the assault, and setting fire to the city burnt it to the ground, taking the afore-

[1] See before p. 355.

[2] It must have been in 1107 that William, count de Poitiers, restored the young Fulk to his father. The latter died the 14th of April, 1109, and was succeeded by Fulk, whose marriage with Eremburga was solemnized in 1110. He had four children by her.

[3] In the last week of Lent, 1105, and not 1106.

said governor, with his followers and fellow soldiers prisoners.[1]

On learning the destruction of this important city, the other garrisons were struck with terror, and afraid to offer any resistance to the king who was advancing with so much resolution. The people of Caen, hearing of the destruction of Bayeux and apprehensive of being exposed to like ruin, sent envoys to the king who was hastening thither in great rage, and made peace with him on the terms he dictated.[2] Accordingly they presently expelled the governor Enguerrand, son of Ilbert,[3] with his troops and surrendered the fortress to the king. Henry gave Darlington in England, worth eighty pounds of yearly rent, to the four principal townsmen of Caen,[4] and it is called the traitors' village to this day, although it does not now belong to them. The king then marched to Falaise, but did not attack it because count Elias retired at the request of the Normans.[5] There was however a passage at arms there, in which Roger de Gloucester, a brave knight, was slain.[6]

[1] This event occurred in the month of August, 1105. The garrison of the castle abandoned the defence of the ramparts in a cowardly manner and fled to the cathedral for refuge. The destruction of that magnificent edifice was the consequence.

[2] Robert Curthose was at Caen during these negotiations, which are given by Wace in much greater detail. The duke was compelled to make a precipitate retreat, and could not even prevent the pillage of his baggage.

[3] This Enguerrand appears to have been son of Ilbert de Laci. We have seen before the devoted attachment of this family to the duke, and the confidence he placed in them.

[4] The names of the four traitors are preserved. The first who principally managed this dark intrigue was named Theodore, son of Ralph, son of Ogier, a knight.

[5] The events just related occurred in the month of July. Count Elias having been persuaded by the Normans to withdraw, and having executed this movement, Henry felt from his failure at Falaise, that his forces would not be strong enough during the rest of the campaign to terminate the struggle with his unfortunate brother. He, therefore, returned to England suddenly in the month of August, deferring the completion of his conquest to the following year. Our author's anachronism at the beginning of the chapter is therefore apparent. If these occurrences took place in 1106, Henry could not have found himself in the month of September in Normandy with Count Elias and a force sufficient to crush the duke's army at Tinchebrai. It required an interval of a year to prepare for the decisive blow.

[6] Roger de Gloucester had time enough after his mortal wound to make

The brother princes, the king and the duke met at Cinteaux in Whitsun-week, and held a conference which lasted two days on terms of peace;[1] but as discordant factions interrupted the negotiations, they parted without coming to any agreement. Both parties now made preparations for carrying on the war with all their strength, the nobles and young knights choosing the side to which they should adhere, and from Whitsuntide to the feast of St. Michael,[2] the country was pillaged and given to the flames.

CH XVIII. *Death of the emperor Henry IV.—His son Henry V. marries the princess Matilda.*

THEN Henry, emperor of Germany, died on the seventh of the ides [7th] of August, but as he had not made satisfaction to God, in the judgment of the church, for his numerous crimes his remains were not committed to the earth, nor did they obtain the rites of sepulture for many years. Charles Henry V. his son succeeded him as emperor, and three years afterwards married Matilda daughter of Henry king of England, but had by her no heir[3] to the throne.

CH. XIX. *The simoniacal abbot of Dive undertakes to betray King Henry—The king storms his fortress—The abbot's tragical end.*

ROBERT, the intrusive abbot of Dive, amongst his other evil deeds, added the treason of Judas [Iscariot] to the iniquity of

a gift to the abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester which was confirmed by King Henry.—*Monast. Anglic.* vol. i. p. 113.

[1] This interview between the two brothers at Cinteaux, near Falaise, must also be assigned to the year 1105, in the end of May or beginning of June, Whitsuntide that year falling on the 28th of May. The siege of Falaise must, therefore, have taken place in that month.

[2] The state of disorder and anarchy lasted not only four months, as our author states, but sixteen; from Whitsuntide, 28th of May, 1105, to the end of September, 1106. Two circumstances concurred in inducing King Henry to defer his projects for the entire deposition of his brother, the retreat of count Elias, which, as already suggested, did not leave him a sufficient force to act decidedly, and the exhaustion of his treasury by the insatiable covetousness of the Norman lords, who were quite as ready to sell themselves to the king as he was to buy them.

[3] The emperor Henry IV. died at Liège, the 7th of August, 1107. His corpse was carried to Spires, where it remained unburied, on account of his being excommunicated. Henry V. did not marry Matilda till January 7, 1114, and consequently many years later than our author states.

Simon (Magus).[1] He made an agreement with duke Robert and his barons at Falaise to bring King Henry, into their power before long, attended by only a few followers, and the Normans were to be prepared to lay hands on the king. This treachery having been planned, abbot Robert went to Caen and meeting the king said to him in a friendly manner, "If you will come with me, I will put into your hands the fortress which I have on the river Dive." The king being pleased with this offer, the abbot added: "It is not requisite that you should bring an army with you, for such numbers would occasion a great noise and might be an obstacle to our enterprise. I have only a small garrison in the place, and they are entirely devoted to me."

In consequence, the king rose by night, and putting himself at the head of seven hundred horsemen rode all night and at day break found himself near the place. Meanwhile, Reynold de Warrenne[2] and the young Robert d'Estoteville,[3] with one hundred and forty men-at-arms, had increased the garrison at Dive, and when the king arrived at sun-rise received him with shouts of laughter and abuse. They were also followed by many other troops from Falaise and other castles in the neighbourhood who sought the opportunity of coming to close quarters with the king and his partisans. Henry, much enraged at finding the snare into which he had fallen, gave orders for an instant assault on the garrison. The royal troops therefore made a fierce attack, and hurling fire burnt both the fortress and monastery. Reynold and Robert, brave young knights, and several others, were made prisoners, many also who had taken refuge in the tower of the church were burnt. Their adherents who were hastening to support

[1] This evidently belongs to the year 1106. In consequence of the anachronism which has been pointed out, Ordericus omits to mention the interview at Northampton, noticed by Henry of Huntingdon and described with simple pathos by John Brompton, when Robert threw himself in vain at the feet of the author of his misfortunes.

On Assumption day the king and St. Anselm met at the abbey of Bec, in the centre of the duke's dominions, and within ten leagues of his capital.

[2] Reynold de Warrenne, brother of William, second of the name, earl of Surrey. The two brothers fought on opposite sides.

[3] Robert d'Estoteville, third of that name, and son of the knight mentioned by our author just before (p. 367) in connection with a miraculous occurrence on Easter day, the preceding year.

them, seeing the vast body of flame, made all the haste they could to return to Falaise. The victorious king pursued their steps, but no one ventured to sally forth and encounter him. Evil fell upon them deservedly, according to what the apostle says. "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy."[1] Behold they had converted the house of God into a den of thieves, irreverently polluting it with the dung of men and horses, and they met the fate they merited by the sword or devouring flame.

The traitor Robert was taken, and having been thrown across a horse like a sack, was brought before the king, who said to him: "Traitor, begone from my territories: were it not for my respect to the sacred order, whose habit you wear, I would have you this moment torn limb from limb." The apostate being therefore set at liberty fled with shame to France where he was born, and not being able to submit to the poverty and quiet of a monk in a cloister, he obtained the office of provost of Argenteuil.[2] In the course of the same year having taken proceedings against one John, and violently demanded some customary payment, of which I know not the particulars, the peasant in a great rage struck him dead, and thus the miserable man expired without having done penance for his sins, of which he had great need.

CH. XX. *King Henry resumes hostilities in Normandy—his message to Duke Robert—Battle of Tinchebrai—Robert taken prisoner—The king assumes the government and marches to Rouen.*

THE autumn of this year in Normandy was marked by thunder storms and violent rains as well as battles, and the flames of war, fanned by a variety of circumstances, burst forth openly. In truth, Robert de Belèsme and William earl of Morton, with many others, obstinately attached themselves to Robert the duke, and fearing the king too much to think of submitting to his yoke, resisted him with all their power. In consequence, Henry having assembled a vast multitude of his adherents, constructed a fort before Tin-

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 17.

[2] Argenteuil, near Paris, first an abbey for nuns, and then a priory dependent on the abbey of St. Denys.

chebrai,[1] and stationed in it Thomas de St. Jean,[2] with a large body of horse and foot to check the sallies of the garrison. William, earl of Morton, to whom the place belonged, collected a gallant band of troops, and threw into it a convoy of provisions and other things of which he knew the besieged were in need in sight of the royal army, and to their great annoyance. He caused the green corn to be cut in the fields[3] and supplied to the garrison as forage for the horses. The activity of this young nobleman was such, and he possessed so large a share of military skill, that the royal army engaged in the siege could not venture out of their intrenchments and engage with his troops to intercept the relief they threw into the fortress. On receiving intelligence of this the king was very indignant, and took measures for a more determined attack on the enemy. In consequence he united his troops before Tinchebrai, and pressed the siege for some time.

Under these circumstances, William earl of Morton, claimed the aid of the duke, and of Robert de Belèsme and his other friends, and speedly obtained succour against the king. The duke having assembled an army, required his brother to raise the siege of a place which lay in his territories, or otherwise he challenged him to battle. The king however, persisted in carrying on the siege, and accepted the duke's hostility, though it was worse than a civil war, in order to secure peace for the future. There were four counts in the royal army, Elias of Maine, William of Evreux, Robert de Mellent, and William de Warrenne, with several great barons, viz.: Ranulf of Bayeux,[4] Ralph de Conches, Robert de Montfort, Robert de Grantmesnil, and several others, with their vassals. On the other side, Duke Robert had with him Robert de Belèsme and his nephew William earl of Morton, Robert d'Estoteville,[5] William de Ferrers,[6] and many more with their followers. He could

[1] Tinchebrai near Domfront, between that place, Vine, and Briouse.

[2] His domains lay between Avranches and Granville.

[3] We cannot understand what corn-crops could be growing at this season of the year.

[4] Ranulf de Briquessart, viscount of Bayeux. See vol. ii. p. 505.

[5] Robert d'Estoteville, the father. See before pp. 367, and 374; not the son, who had been taken prisoner at the assault on Dive, and was not released till the eve of the battle of Tinchebrai.

[6] For William de Ferrers, see vol. ii. p. 508. In the interval he accompanied Duke Robert to the Holy Land.

not muster so many knights as his brother, but his army contained a more numerous body of infantry. In the opposite forces now in presence, brothers and kinsmen were arrayed on different sides, and some of them were ready to exchange blows with each other. Some treacherous deserters were also under arms, but they were not firm in their adhesion to the duke, and in their disaffection thought more of flight than resistance.

Several men of religion interfered to prevent so horrible a conflict, dreading to be witnesses of brothers shedding each other's blood. Especially Vitalis the hermit,[1] who was considered one of the most venerable persons of the times, was more zealous than the rest, and interposing as arbiter between the contending brothers, boldly interdicted them from a single combat, lest the tragedy of the sons of Œdipus, the horror of all ages, should be again acted, and the fearful and accursed fate of Eteocles and Polynices should justly become theirs.

At length the king carefully reviewed the complicated state of affairs, and, having collected the opinions of his sage advisers, reflected deeply on their various counsels. He then sent a message to his brother of the following tenor: "My brother," he said, "I have not come here actuated by worldly ambition, nor did I propose to deprive you of your rights in the duchy, but, in answer to the sorrowful complaints of the poor, my desire is to succour the church of God, which is like a vessel without a pilot, in peril from a tempestuous sea. As for you planted in this land like a barren tree, you offer no fruit of good works to our Creator. You are duke in name only, while you are openly mocked by your vassals, and take no pains to punish the insults you receive. Thus the cruel sons of iniquity, under the shade of your protection, oppress by their iniquities the Christian people, and have already almost depopulated whole parishes in Normandy. Witnessing these things, I

[1] The holy Vitalis, a native of Tierceville, in Bessin, had already received a promise of the site of his abbey from Ralph de Fouchères, but it was not confirmed by charter till 1112. He also possessed the entire confidence of the count of Mortain, whose chaplain he was, and who placed under his superintendence, in 1105, the rising abbey of Neuborg de Mortain.

burn with zeal for God, who is our ruler, and am eager to expose my life in the cause of my brethren, and this beloved people and country. Taking these things into consideration, I entreat you to profit by my advice, and you will find it distinctly proved that my proceedings are not dictated by ambition, but by goodwill. Yield to me all the strong places in Normandy, with the entire administration of justice and the management of affairs, and one moiety of the duchy, reserving to yourself the revenues of the other half, without care or trouble, and I will pay you annually out of the treasury of England, a sum equivalent to the revenue of the moiety ceded to me. After that you may revel in feasts and sports and all such delights with perfect security. As for me, I shall submit to the toils required for the maintenance of tranquillity, and, while you enjoy repose, faithfully acquit myself of the engagements I enter into with you, and by God's help, bridle with justice the fury of the oppressors, so that they shall no longer buffet the people of God."[1]

On receiving this message, the duke summoned his counsellors, and laid before them the king's proposals, which they unhesitatingly rejected, and deterred the duke by their violent language from listening to the conditions of peace. The royal ambassadors having announced on their return that the duke and his adherents preferred war at all hazards rather than peace, the king commending himself to God, said: "God Almighty, in whom I trust, knows that I fight this battle on behalf of his suffering people. I implore our Maker, from the bottom of my heart, to grant the victory in this day's conflict to him by whom it is the divine will to secure to his people protection and rest.[2]

[1] We know not whether this message is authentic, but it was impossible to use language more disdainful or more hypocritical.

[2] It appears from this passage and several others that our author gave Henry credit for the truth of these hypocritical protestations. All the Norman clergy offered prayers for his success, less, perhaps, on account of their being shocked by the licentious morals of Robert Curthose, than because his indolence and weakness offered no guarantee for the security of their persons and of ecclesiastical property from the strong hand of violence.

The clergy had a third cause of aversion to Robert Curthose; his having declined the crown of Jerusalem, when it was offered him, after the city was taken, before all other competitors because of his rank as a king's son.

Having said this, he assembled the commanders of his forces, and laying before them his plan of operations in the battle, briefly directed them to act as time and circumstances required. Releasing Reynold de Warrenne and the rest who were made prisoners in the abbey at St. Pierre-sur-Dive, he vowed to God to rebuild the church which was burnt down. He then drew out his troops in battle array, and they marched forward in well disciplined order. Ranulf of Bayeux, commanded the first division, Robert earl of Morton, the second, and William de Warrenne the third. This earl William was very thankful for his brother's liberation, and earnestly exhorted all his comrades to fight with the utmost determination. The king reserved the English and Norman infantry for his own command, stationing the Manceaux and Bretons,[1] at some distance on the field, under the orders of count Elias.

In the enemy's army, William earl of Morton led the first division, and Robert de Belèsme commanded the rear. When the ranks met, and the squadrons of Earl William attemped to charge Ranulf's division, the troops were thronged so closely, and their weapons so locked together that it was out of their power to injure each other, and both parties in turn attempted in vain to break the impenetrable

Henry of Huntingdon says: "Thus the Lord took vengeance on Duke Robert, because when he had exalted him to great glory in the holy wars, he rejected the offer of the kingdom of Jerusalem, preferring a service of ease and sloth in Normandy to serving the Lord zealously in defence of the holy city."—*Antiq. Lib.* p. 242. All the misfortunes which befel the duke, even the loss of the battle of Tinchebrai and his long and close captivity were considered the just punishment of his crime of treason against the Divine Majesty. Henry I. made good use of this prejudice, as if the refusal did not arise from a sense of his own want of ability and judgment, which rendered him unfit for a post surrounded by so many difficulties and dangers.

[1] William of Malmesbury says of the Bretons (whom he calls the Britons over the sea) that Henry, in his early days, took into his pay a number of them from the neighbourhood of his fortresses, Domfront and Castle-St. Michael, they being a people who, suffering much want in their own country, were always ready to sell their services abroad (Hist. b. v.). These lawless bands were the scourge of Normandy and England, having no respect either for the persons or the property of the ecclesiastics. They were particularly addicted to stealing the horses belonging to the clergy, appropriating them to their own purposes wherever they could lay their hands on them.

phalanx. Cries and shouts being raised from both armies, Elias made a rapid charge with his auxiliaries on the flank of the duke's ill-armed infantry, in which two hundred and twenty-five of them presently fell. As soon as Robert de Belèsme perceived this, he took to flight, leaving the conquerors to deal with the duke's army, which was now in complete confusion.[1]

Then Baudri seized the duke and delivered him to the king's guards. This man was one of Henry's chaplains, who joining a body of knights took part in the battle. He was shortly afterwards made bishop of Laon, but having deeply aggrieved the people of his diocese, he was killed by the inhabitants of his own city, in a garden, on Friday in Easter week, with seven dignitaries of his cathedral.[2]

[1] Ordericus gives a very meagre account of the important battle of Tinchebrai. Henry of Huntingdon supplies some few additional details, showing that Henry's victory was not quite so easily won as our author intimates. "The duke," he says, "with his few followers boldly charged the king's numerous troops, and, well trained in the wars of Jerusalem, his furious onset repulsed the royal army. William, earl of Morton, also attacking it from point to point, threw it into confusion. The king and the duke, with great part of their troops, fought on foot that they might make a determined stand, but the Breton knights bore down on the flank of the duke's army, which, unable to sustain the shock, was presently routed." —*Antiq. Lib.* p. 242.

Ordericus has not even recorded the precise day on which the battle was fought, but we know from abundant sources of authority that it was on the 28th of September, the eve of St. Michael, and the anniversary of William the Conqueror's landing at Hastings in 1066.

Our author has also omitted to inform us that Edgar Atheling, who had so often exhibited his attachment to the duke, accompanied him to the fatal field of Tinchebrai, and was made prisoner with his friend. King Henry thought the Anglo-Saxon prince a person of such small importance that he at once dismissed him.

[2] It appears that Baudri employed the wealth heaped upon him for the capture of Robert Curthose to secure his election by the chapter of Laon. But this profanation did not last long. Public opinion revolted at seeing a mere clerk attached to the court, who was not even a subdeacon, raised to the episcopal and ducal see of Laon. By the king's influence, who probably was glad to be rid of him, he was provided with a canonry of Rouen, and received subdeacon's orders. However, it was only by the intervention of Pope Paschal II. to whom Baudri appealedat Dijon, that he was confirmed in his see. But as he was grossly ignorant, associated only with the military, and could talk of nothing but dogs and horses, he became odious to his clergy, who accused him of several murders and other acts of violence. At last, having opposed the establishment of the municipality

The Bretons, on their side, took William earl of Morton,[1] and the king and his friends had great difficulty in getting him out of their hands. Robert d'Estoteville, William de Ferrers, and many others were taken prisoners, some of whom were released by the king's favour, and rejoiced in the recovery of their liberty, while others, for their offences, were detained in prison till the day of their death.

The king, having gained the victory, re-assembled his troops, made a prudent disposition of affairs, and gave orders for the strict custody of his captive enemies. The duke Robert thus addressed him: "Some Norman traitors led me astray by their perfidious counsels, and deterred me, my brother, from following your advice, which it would have been really to my advantage to have embraced. I begged the people of Falaise, when I left them, not to surrender the fortress to any one but myself or William de Ferrers, whose fidelity to me I have never had reason to doubt. Now therefore, my brother, lose no time in sending William to receive the surrender of the place lest Robert de Belèsme should forestall you by some stratagem, and being the first to get possession of this strong fortress, hold it long against you." Henry led his brother with him in a friendly manner, but with due caution, and immediately despatched William de Ferrers to obtain possession of the castle. The king himself, quickly following, made a hasty march to Falaise, and, by the duke's own order, the fortress was put into his hands, and the burgesses paid him fealty. They then presented to him the young William, who was brought up in that place, and the king, looking with an eye of compassion on the boy, who, trembling with fear, was exposed to such misfortunes in his tender years, comforted him with promises of kindness. Afterwards to prevent occasion for calumny, if any mischance should befall the lad while he was

of Laon, he was massacred in a popular tumult on Tuesday, the 22nd of April, 1112, and his body having been subjected to a thousand outrages, was left naked in the public street till the next day. He was at length buried, out of compassion, but without ceremony or prayers. See *Gall. Christ.* t. ix. col. 526, &c.

[1] It would have been better for the earl of Morton to have remained in the hands of the Bretons than to have fallen into those of his royal uncle. They might have put him to death, but probably would not have torn out his eyes.

in his hands, he resolved not to retain him under his own guardianship, and entrusted his education to Elias de St. Saens.[1] For the duke had some time before given his daughter, by a concubine, in marriage to that knight, and granting to him the county of Arques,[2] made him rank high among the barons of Normandy.

The clergy felt exceeding joy on receiving intelligence of the king's victory, while all who set the law at defiance, and were abandoned to evil courses, were filled with sorrow and dismay, knowing well that a yoke they could not shake off was now imposed by Heaven on their stubborn necks. In consequence, the factious free-booters finding that the king who had already proved a stern administrator of justice, had by God's aid defeated his enemies in the battle, were so convinced of his great qualities that they immediately dispersed into various retreats, and ceased from their outrages from mere dread of his name. The bands of robbers thus scattered, even changed their dress in order to escape being recognized by those they had before oppressed.

The king proceeded to Rouen, accompanied by the duke, and the citizens receiving him with acclamations, he restored the laws of the Conqueror, and re-established the ancient privileges of the city. Hugh de Nonant, by the duke's orders surrendered the castle of Rouen into the king's hands, and recovering his own domains by the king's assistance from Robert de Belèsme, who had violently usurped them, he held them free from disturbance for the rest of his life. The other lords of castles throughout the whole of Normandy were released by the duke from their fealty to him, and, with his consent, transferred them to the victorious king, with whom they were reconciled.

Ch. XXI. *King Henry summons the Norman barons to Lisieux and makes decrees for restoring order—The prisoners removed to England.*

In the middle of October the king came to Lisieux, where

[1] Elias de St. Saens, near Neufchâtel, son of Lambert de St. Saens, whose father, it is said, was Richard, viscount of Rouen, and his mother, a niece of the duchess Guimor. For this genealogy, which is doubtful, see the continuator of William de Jumièges; Duchesne's edition, p. 343.

[2] The county of Arques, formerly called the county of Talou.

he summoned all the barons of Normandy to meet him, and held a council, from which the church reaped great advantage.[1] It was there declared by the royal authority, that peace should be strictly observed through the whole of Normandy, that robbery and violence being repressed in every quarter, the churches, and other lawful proprietors should possess their lands as they held them at the time of William the Conqueror's death. He also took into his own hands all the fiefs which belonged to his father, annulling, by advice of his council, all the grants which his brother had made through his imprudence, or which had been wrung from him during his feeble administration. The king sent over to England all his enemies taken in the war, condemning William earl of Morton, Robert d'Estoteville, and several others to perpetual imprisonment. He was inflexible in his resolution to treat them with this severity, and constantly withstood all the influence of entreaties, promises, and gifts from many quarters, employed to mollify his resentment.

CH. XXII. *Robert de Belèsme submits to King Henry, after consulting with Count Elias, who mediates between them.*

MEANWHILE, Robert de Belèsme, finding all his hopes frustrated, and affairs turning out very differently from what he expected, was reduced to great distress, but still struggling to try the fate of war against King Henry, had recourse to Count Elias: "Sir count," he said, "I pray you lend me your aid, for I am your own liege-man, and have great reliance on you. Under present circumstances I look to you for succour, for the affairs of the world are in strange confusion. You see a younger son in arms against his elder brother, a vassal defeating his superior in battle, and throwing him into prison; he has robbed him of the heritage of his ancestors, and usurped his rights by forfeiting his oath of fealty. For my part, I have maintained my allegiance to my natural lord, and as I faithfully obeyed the father, will serve the

[1] The meeting at Lisieux was not a council, properly so called, as no decrees were made respecting the doctrine or discipline of the church. Ranulf Flambard must have previously submitted to the king, or it would scarcely have been held at Lisieux; the wary politician lost no time in adopting his course.

son for the rest of my days. Never while my life is spared will I permit the man to govern Normandy in tranquillity who holds in chains the prince, who is my liege-lord, and, what is more, his own. I am still in possession of thirty four castles, which are strongly fortified, and from whence I can assuredly infest the usurper with most harassing irruptions. I only require your aid to enable me to succour my captive lord, and restore to him or to his heir the duchy of Normandy.

Elias replied to this application in the following words: "Every prudent man should be careful, in the first instance, not to enter on any undertaking which he cannot or should not carry into effect. Again, it is his duty not to attempt to raise any one to an elevation of which he is not worthy, or place him in command over others, who cannot rule himself. For as the common proverb says: 'He who tries to support a fool's pretensions, has the presumption to contend with God.' I am in alliance with King Henry, and I can find no pretence for severing it. I have no desire to give causeless offence to so powerful a prince, and I ought not to listen to you or any one else in this affair. He is endowed with judgment, power, and wealth, and there is no one in my opinion, who is his equal in these western countries. If, as you assert, he has made war on his elder brother and his superior lord, he was driven to it by imperious necessity, and has been called in by the prayers of the churchmen who were miserably persecuted by accursed ruffians. Moreover, to adopt a phrase which is in daily use: 'One must do evil to prevent what is still worse.' I speak thus according to the vulgar proverb, but do not mean to claim divine authority for it. For once there has been a battle between two brothers, that those everlasting conflicts which made the land drunk with the blood of her sons may for ever cease. From the moment the duke returned from Jerusalem and resumed the government of the duchy of Normandy, he abandoned himself to an idle and careless life. Encouraged by his indolence, the enemies of order have insufferably devastated Normandy by their ravages, both clandestinely and in the face of day, and our holy mother church has been for six years exposed to grievous losses by fire and pillage. In consequence crowds of poor people have been driven to

to seek refuge in foreign countries, and the converts of the monks have been spoiled of the property and possessions, with which they were endowed by pious barons. No one escaped the violence of these lawless men; distress and alarm universally prevailed. The flood of evils continually increasing, almost all reverence for divine worship was lost. It is needless to dwell on this melancholy state of affairs. In various parts of Normandy we witness the churches burnt, the dioceses depopulated of the parishioners, and the cities and villages in all quarters a prey to disorders and calamities. It is you and your fellows who have ruined this noble province, and roused the anger of God against yourselves. It is by God's righteous providence that victory has been divinely vouchsafed to the guardians of peace and justice, and that their adversaries have been utterly crushed. I can by no means agree to revolt against King Henry, lest I should offend the Almighty who is evidently his protector, and provoke his wrath against myself. If however, abandoning your evil courses and crooked policy, you are desirous of conciliating the favour of this powerful monarch, you may rely on my readiness to become a mediator with him on your behalf."

Robert de Belèsme, finding Elias inflexible in his resolution not to join his disorderly faction, and being satisfied that his counsels were profitable and full of good sense, suddenly changed his mind, which was naturally versatile, and thanking his sage adviser, employed him to effect his reconciliation with King Henry. As a very confidential intercourse was maintained between the king and the count, Elias secured Argentan to Robert de Belèsme, on his restoring all the fiefs belonging to the dukedom of which he had obtained possession, but he was reinstated in the viscounty of Falaise and whatever domains belonged to his father.

CH. XXIII. *King Henry, keeping his brother Robert a close prisoner, holds Normandy the rest of his life—His political and personal character.*

KING HENRY having, by God's help, humbled his enemies, he razed to the ground all the unlicensed castles[1] which Robert

[1] *Adulterina castella.* To clearly understand this passage, reference must be made to what our author has said before b. viii. c. 1, p. 427.

[de Belèsme] and other factious nobles had erected. He sent his brothers to England to prevent the malcontents from disturbing the peace of the well-disposed, under colour of taking the duke's part, who was therefore kept a close prisoner for twenty-seven years, but amply supplied with luxuries of every kind. Meanwhile, Henry governed the duchy of Normandy as well as his kingdom of England with a firm hand, being to the end of his days careful to maintain peace; and though he enjoyed his prosperity according to his own pleasure, he never faltered in his stern career and the severity with which he administered justice. His able policy enabled him to keep the greatest nobles and lords of castles, and the most turbulent barons, in due subjection, while he was at all times ready to encourage and protect his peaceable subjects, the men of the church and the commons of the land. His power being established on both sides of the channel in the eighth year of his reign,[1] it was his constant endeavour to procure peace for the populations under his rule, and he rigorously punished offenders against whom he enacted severe laws. Surrounded by all the indulgences which his vast wealth could procure, he was criminally addicted to one vice[2] from the days of his youth until he was advanced in years, having had several sons and daughters by concubines.[3] By his unwearied industry he profusely

of the number of castles illegally erected by the Norman nobility, as soon as they found themselves relieved from William the Conqueror's iron yoke. The barons who possessed ancient castles expelled at the same time the governors and garrisons who had the custody of them in the duke's name, and occupied them with their own retainers. It was Henry's first object to put an end to these disorders.

[1] This computation is incorrect; see the note p. 273.

[2] *Huic vitio;* Ordericus might have conscientiously used the plural number. Avarice, at least, was one of Henry I.'s most deeply-rooted and odious vices; he made a market of every thing, to provide means of paying for the secret information, corruption, and treachery which he organized on a vast scale.

[3] It is but justice to remark that if Ordericus has too often represented some of the worst parts of Henry's conduct in too favourable a light, he very frankly condemns in this passage his irregular life, a task from which other cotemporary historians have shrunk. The singular apology offered by William of Malmesbury must be quoted in its original language:—"*Omnium tota vita obscenitatum cupidinearum expers, quoniam* (*ut a conseiis accepimus*) *non effreni voluptate, sed gignendæ prolis amore, mulierum gremio infunderetur, nec dignaretur advenæ dilectationi præ-

augmented his worldly wealth, amassing vast stores of all valuable objects which he coveted. Reserving for his own sport the beasts of chace in the forests of England, he even caused all dogs kept on the verge of the woods to be mutilated by having one of their claws chopped off, and reluctantly licensed some few of the greater nobles and his particular friends to have the privilege of hunting in their own forests. A close observer, he investigated all subjects with great acuteness, and his memory was very tenacious of the information he received.[1] His inquiries extended to all the proceedings of his ministers and great officers, and he regulated the multiplied affairs of England and Normandy according to the dictates of his own sagacious judgment. He penetrated every one's secrets, and the most private transactions, so that the actors were at a loss to understand how the king obtained his knowledge. After a careful examination of ancient history, I boldly assert that, in regard to worldly prosperity, no king of England was mightier or richer than Henry.

CH. XXIV. *Robert de Montfort banished—He joins, with other knights, Bohemond's expedition against the emperor Alexius—Its failure before Durazzo—The Franks disperse, after a humiliating treaty.*

IN the year of our Lord 1107, King Henry assembled his barons, and appealed to them for judgment against Robert de Montfort,[2] on a charge of having broken his fealty. Being conscious of his guilt, he obtained leave to depart for Jerusalem, giving up all his lands to the king. He then

here assensum, nisi ubi semen regium procedere posset in effectum; effundens naturam ut dominus, non obtemperans libidini ut famulus."

[1] Our author might have added that Henry I. was curious in objects connected with zoology. He established a menagerie at Woodstock, in which he collected lions, leopards, camels, and lynxes. There was also a porcupine sent to him by William of Montpellier, of which Malmesbury speaks with great admiration. The king was very proud of this collection, which he took great pains to increase by applications to princes with whom he had friendly relations. To gratify him in this particular was one of the best means of making court to him, and we are told that Paul, earl of Orkney, often employed it.

[2] This nobleman, as we have already learnt, was commander-in-chief of the Norman army in Maine in the year 1090. He was brother of Hugh, third of that name, and uncle of Hugh IV. de Montfort, who married Adeline de Meulan.

commenced his journey in company with some of his companions in arms, and arriving in Apulia, met Bohemond, and found to his joy several of his countrymen. For Hugh de Puiset,[1] Simon Anet, Ralph de Pont-Echanfré, and Josceline his brother,[2] and some other Cisalpines were with Bohemond. Several knights from other countries were waiting for an opportunity of crossing the sea, all desirous of fighting with the duke against the emperor, and in the meantime both they and their horses were maintained by Bohemond's liberality. He supported so many troops for two years that he exhausted his treasury; providing also cheerfully ships for all without any passage money. He gave a hearty welcome to Robert de Montfort, and not having learnt the cause of his quitting his native country, as he was hereditary marshal of Normandy[3] the duke gave him a high rank in his army. He had long assembled ships and troops in the ports of Italy, and furnished all with abundant provisions out of his revenues, so that a powerful armament was prepared for making war on the emperor. At length the crusaders sailed to Thessaly,[4] with a fair wind, and besieged Durazzo for a long time. The magnanimous duke tried various methods of assaulting the place, but he found his greatest impediment in those who ought to have seconded his efforts. Even his brother Guy and Robert de Montfort, in whom he trusted most, had the treachery to espouse the emperor's cause, and being blinded by the large bribes he sent them, had the address to derange the plans of their chief.[5] For the duke having prepared his engines, and

[1] This was not the first crusader of this family who went to the Holy Land. See before p. 78.

[2] See before p. 367.

[3] It does not appear how Robert de Montfort possessed an hereditary title to command the army of Normandy; if any such right existed it would have belonged to his eldest brother.

[4] Bohemond's fleet was moored in the port of Valonna the 9th of October, 1107, and his army encamped before Durazzo the 13th of the same month.

[5] Anna Comnena denies these intrigues in the crusaders' camp, adding that the report was invented by her father to sow discord among Bohemond's followers. But as that chief was brutal and avaricious, while the emperor was a rich and practised corrupter, and the Frank warriors were greedy and dispirited adventurers, there seems nothing improbable in the accounts given by the Western writers. As to Guy's treason, the historian

appointed a certain day for making the assault, they on some crafty pretence demanded a truce or gave the enemy clandestine intelligence by which they might avoid their imminent danger. In this manner Bohemond and his army were long deceived by the treachery of his friends, and provisions begining to fail, the crusaders dwindled away in a foreign land. At length, not being able to endure the severe famine, they deserted in small bands, and dispersing through Macedonia, came to the emperor's terms, who gave them the choice of either remaining in his service, or departing where they pleased. Many of them partook of his ample donations, and enjoying his munificence, returned him thanks for relieving them from their state of utter penury.

Bohemond was much distressed on finding that he could not accomplish his vast designs, but although daily pressed by his comrades to seek the emperor's favour, he long refused. They argued thus: "We are paying the penalty of our own rashness in having engaged in a bold enterprise far from our native country and beyond our strength, and having presumed to raise our hands against the holy empire. We have not been led to join in this expedition to sustain our hereditary rights, nor has any prophet sent by God roused us to arms by divine oracles; but you are actuated by the ambition of ruling in the teritories of another prince to engage in this arduous enterprise, and, as for us, the love of money has led us to undergo the burden of toils and battles. But as God is not mocked, and his judgments fail not, nor does he subvert justice, he has heard with favour the prayers of those who cry to him against us in Greece, and has dispersed our troops, enfeebled not by battle but by famine, and destroyed our force without effusion of blood. We entreat you therefore to make peace with the emperor before you fall into his hands and are condemned to death, and by your loss all your followers are plunged into inextricable difficulties.[1]

of Louis-le-Gros is still more explicit than our author: "Bohemond asking him what had been going on, he confessed that the emperor had promised to give him his daughter, with Durazzo, and other rewards; that the place would have been long ago stormed, or given up by the citizens but for his communications with them. Having revealed this enormous wickedness, he retired, followed with curses.

[1] Among Bohemond's companions in arms who poured forth these complaints, we may distinguish Hugh Bunel, the assassin of Mabel de Belèsme,

By this language the valiant duke understood plainly the disaffection of his comrades, and being apprehensive of incurring the disgrace of an irretrievable disaster, he gave a reluctant consent, and, making peace with the emperor[1] returned in deep grief to Apulia. Feeling great confusion in presence of the French to whom he had promised extensive sovereignties, he gave them leave, with shame, to pursue their pilgrimage.[2] Then Hugh de Puiset, Ralph de Pont Erchanfré, with Josceline his brother, and many others proceeded to Constantinople,[3] where they were honoured by the emperor Alexius with noble gifts, and from thence they continued their journey to Jerusalem. The wife of Ralph, who was daughter of Goislen de Lèves,[4] died in the imperial city, and was buried there with great solemnity. Some of the pilgrims having performed their devotions returned to their native country, and ended their career by various accidents. Guy fell sick soon afterwards, and publicly confessed the treachery of which he had been guilty, but he could never obtain his pardon from his brother. Robert de Montfort also, his accomplice in the treason, died about the same time, and no one said a word in his praise.

Ch. XXV. *Death of Bohemond and Tancred—Roger their successor at Antioch falls in battle with the Turks—Bohemond II. becomes prince of Antioch.*

In the year of our Lord 1111, the fourth indication, Mark

who, being proscribed had long sought his fortunes in the East (see before p. 170). "Prince," said he to Bohemond, "of all the knights who are come here to do battle, there is not one who has had an opportunity of using his lance. We are fighting against stone walls. Make peace, and let us be gone."—*Hist. du Bas-Empire*, t. 84, p. 1108.

[1] This treaty, the humiliating conditions of which may be seen in the work just referred to (t. 18, p. 382), is dated in the month of September, 1108. Anna Comnena has preserved to us the verbose engagements imposed on Bohemond, but unfortunately does not give the signatures nor even the names of any of his followers.

[2] We doubt very much whether this licence was explicitly granted. Bohemond not only broke all his promises to his companions in arms, but he returned to Apulia without taking leave of them.

[3] This journey did not take place till the spring of 1109.

[4] Gouellain de Lèves, near Chartres. The family of Giroie with which Ralph was connected on his mother's side, was intimately related to several houses in the district of Chartres. See vol. i., pp. 451, &c.

Bohemond died, after many conflicts and triumphs in the name of Jesus.[1] Tancred, that knight so renowned for his defeats of the Pagans, was his uncle's successor for several years.[2] On his death Roger, son of Richard, a cousin of the before named princes, obtained the principality of Antioch, but, entangled in difficulties, he did not hold it long.

The death of these invincible princes being known through all the world became the cause of deep grief to the Christians and exultation to the Pagans. In consequence, Emir Gazis,[3] nephew of the sultan, prince of Persia, declared war against the Christians, and laid siege to Sardanas, a castle of the Christians, ten leagues from Antioch, with a numerous army. Roger, son of Richard, prince of Antioch, marched out to give battle, against the advice of the patriarch Bernard, and without waiting for the arrival of Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, who was summoned to their aid. Roger was a daring and brave knight, but inferior to his two predecessors, being careless, obstinate, and rash.

The patriarch, with paternal solicitude for the safety of his people, thus addressed the impatient duke: "Temper your valour with prudence, brave duke, and wait the arrival of King Baldwin and Josceline, and other faithful knights who are now zealously hastening to our succour. Precipitation has been the ruin of numbers, and the greatest princes have in consequence thrown away life and victory. Look into ancient and modern history, and reflect seriously on the fates of celebrated kings. Think of Saul and Josiah, and Judas Maccabæus, as well as of the defeat of the Romans by Hannibal at Cannæ, and use wise precautions that you do not precipitate yourself and your subjects into similar ruin. Wait for your venerable allies who are eminent for

[1] Bohemond died in the month of February, 1111, not at Antioch according to an interpolation adopted in Duchesne's text of Ordericus, but in Apulia. The original MS. had the word *Antiochiæ*, but it has been erased, probably under the eye and by order of the author.

[2] Tancred did not succeed his uncle in the principality of Antioch, but governed it as guardian of Bohemond II., who was only four years old at his father's death. Nor is it correct to say that the guardianship lasted several years, as Tancred died the 6th of December, 1112.

[3] We may easily recognize the name of Al-Gazy, the Turkoman prince of Maridin and Aleppo, of the family of Ortok, as that of the emir Gazis, given him by our author.

their piety and many virtues, and in company with them fight against the Pagans, in the power of Almighty God, and by his aid you will gain the victory you covet."

The prudent bishop used language of this sort, but the arrogant duke, treating all he said with contempt, marched out and pitched his camp in the plain of Sarmatan, with seven thousand troops. Upon this, the emir Gazis and his numerous bands of Gentiles raised the siege without loss of time, and rushing suddenly from the mountains on the champaign country, covered it like clouds of locusts. Then hurrying to the tents of the Christians, who were taken by surprise, they slew their prince Roger and seven thousand men.[2] Robert de Vieux Pont,[3] and other knights and squires, who had left the camp in the morning for foraging or hawking, or other employments, witnessing this sudden attack, fled seven leagues to the city, and with the fearful news roused the citizens in alarm to defend their country. Nearly one hundred and forty escaped by being out of the camp, and were reserved, by God's mercy, for the protection of the faithful.

On learning these circumstances, the patriarch took measures manfully to defend the city with all the men, both clergy and laity, he was able to muster. Cecilia, daughter of Philip, king of France, Tancred's widow, knighted Gervase the Breton, son of Haimon, viscount of Dol, and invested several other squires with knightly arms to fight against the Pagans. Elated by their great slaughter of the Christains, the emir's troops rapidly advanced in a body to Antioch, thinking they should take the city by surprise, now that its defenders were slain; but by God's providence they were completely repulsed from the fortifications by a small band of the faithful.

At the end of fifteen days, the king of Jerusalem, and

[1] It is quite possible that the patriarch Bernard may have addressed Roger to this effect, though probably with less display of erudition, but it is certain that Bernard remained at Antioch, and the archbishop of Apamea performed the episcopal functions on the field of battle.

[2] The battle in which Roger de Principatu fell, was fought in 1119, near Artesia, at a place called the Field of Blood.

[3] Probably a son of Robert de Vieux-Pont-sur-Dive, who assumed the monastic habit in the abbey there in the reign of William the Conqueror.

Pons, count of Tripoli,[1] united their forces at the castle of Harenc, and giving battle in the name of the merciful Jesus, obtained the victory and broke the power of the infidels. The young knight Gervase slew the emir Gazis, and Christian valour crushed the might of the Gentiles.[2] The Christians were enriched with the spoils of their enemies, and returned hearty thanks to God.

Then king Baldwin[3] took possession of Antioch, in consequence of Tancred's having left no issue,[4] and defended it several years against the Gentiles. At last, the young Bohemond came from Apulia to Syria, and being received with universal joy, married the king's daughter and recovered all his father's territories. He governed them with distinction for four years, treading in his father's steps, but like a bright flower, he soon faded.[5]

Ch. XXVI. *Baldwin II. and some Christian knights fall into an ambush near Edessa, and are detained in captivity—Their escape.*

Meanwhile, Balad,[6] Sahanas, that is the viscount, of Bagdad, who had married the daughter of Rodnan, king of Aleppo and obtained the kingdom in her right, contended fiercely with the Christians for a long period. This old warrior,

[1] Pons, count of Tripoli, grandson of Raymond of St. Giles, succeeded his father Bertrand in 1112. This brave prince married Cecilia of France, Tancred's widow.

[2] The Christians were encamped on the mountain of Danitz when the Moslems attacked them on the 14th of August, 1120. Al-Gazy did not fall in the battle as our author relates, but made his escape and died some time afterwards.

[3] Baldwin II., surnamed du Bourg, eldest son of Hugh, count de Rethel, kinsman of Baldwin I., succeeded him on Easter-day, 1118.

[4] It was not *pro defectu Tancredinæ stirpis* that Baldwin took possession of Antioch, Baldwin's posterity having no right or pretension to the principality, but on account of the extreme youth of Bohemond II., who was then only twelve years old.

[5] He married Alice, twelfth daughter of Baldwin II., and fell in 1130, during the assault of the castle of Athareb by the Atabek Ismaëlian Zenghi, leaving only an infant daughter named Constance. His widow Alice married Zenghi.

[6] In this chapter we go back to the year 1123, and the reign of Balak, nephew and successor of Al-Gazy.

while he was besieging Maubeg,[1] and breathing slaughter against the Christians, learnt that King Baldwin and Josceline with several others intended to go to Rages, and there celebrate the solemnities of Easter. He therefore cautiously drew off from the siege forty thousand men, in the last week of Lent, and on Friday of the Lord's Supper made prisoners Josceline de Turbessel[2] and Waleran de Puiset, who were in advance of the other Christians. Then he concealed himself with his troops, like a wolf, in a dense olive grove, lying in ambush at Ponte-Torres on the Euphrates, on the Saturday of Easter, and waiting for King Baldwin, who was uninformed of what had happened to his friends who preceded him. The insidious enemy on the watch first saw the chaplains and some common people who were unarmed, but, looking out sharply for a worthier prize, he allowed them to pass without molestation. The king following without suspicion at the head of thirty-five horsemen, was immediately seized, and the infidel commander then let loose all his squadrons like savage tigers on the unarmed crowd, and commanded the whole to be put to death on the spot. All these therefore, with the king's chaplains who were in front, were butchered like sheep on the Saturday of Easter.

Balad, exulting in his great success, conducted the king and the knights as prisoners to Charran, and then to Carpetra,[3] where they were confined a long time. This place is remarkable for a vast, stately, and strongly fortified citadel,

[1] Maubeg, the Hierapolis of the Greeks.

[2] Joscelin II. de Courtenai, second son of Josceline I., accompanied Stephen, count de Blois to the Holy Land in 1101. He obtained from Baldwin I. the lordship of Tiberias or Tabaria, and from Baldwin du Bourg the county of Edessa. It was not from a fancy for celebrating Easter at Edessa that the king fell into the ambuscade of Balak, but while he was imprudently on his march there for the relief of Josceline. This knight took his surname of Turbessel from one of the places which Baldwin du Bourg had given him on the west of the Euphrates. He had a brother, Geoffrey de Courtenai, surnamed Chapelu, who also distinguished himself in the Holy Land, and perished there in 1139, while endeavouring to relieve the castle of Montferrand, besieged by the infidels.

We need not be surprised to see one of the family of Puiset in his company. They were neighbours, and probably kinsmen or allies.

[3] Khartpert, Karpout, Quart-Pierre, to the east of the Euphrates and N.E. of Edessa, where Baldwin was imprisoned in the month of February, 1124. It was not till his second captivity that the king was conducted to Charan.

one of the first, in the whole world, of those fortresses which are the strength of tryants.

In this citadel King Baldwin, with Josceline and Waleran, Pons de Gavarret, the viscount, the young knight Gervase, Guiumar the Breton, son of count Alan,[1] and thirty-two knights were confined together for a whole year, as well as forty Armenian and Syrian Christians who were already captives there.

Balad committed the custody of the citadel and the prisoners to three hundred and fifty soldiers, and ordered the king to be tortured by fasting, to compel him to yield up the fortresses which were most desirable. The rest of the prisoners were employed, under guard, in various works and daily labours. Balad then levied a numerous army and led them without delay against the Christian states, whom he expected to find at his mercy in the absence of their chiefs. Having laid siege to the castle of Sardanas, near Antioch, he blockaded the place for a long time, but the mighty God of Sabaoth protecting the garrison, he could not reduce it.

Meanwhile the captives were in servitude to their Gentile keepers, and obeyed their orders, chained by one of their feet. They fetched water daily from the Euphrates, at the distance of a mile, and performed cheerfully other tasks which were enjoined them. The Gentiles treated them kindly as they would do good beasts of burden, and finding them useful artificers and workmen, fed them well that their strength might not fail. King Baldwin only and Josceline were indulged with repose, but they were strictly guarded. By Balad's orders, the king was only allowed food on Sunday and Friday in every week, and then he gave a meal to the three hundred and fifty soldiers who composed his guard. Not only so, but he provided subsistence in great plenty for his companions in captivity, as well as the forty prisoners he found in the castle; exhibiting thus a royal munificence, and at the same time securing the good opinion of the guards. This liberality was a great advantage to the captives, for the gentile soldiers treated them with respect, and, contrary to the orders of Balad, often privately supplied the king with

[1] We know of no son of Alan Fergan called Guiumar, which appears to be the Breton form of Guy. Geoffrey-le-Roux, his second son, died at Jerusalem in 1116.

plentiful meals. The emir of Caloiambar,[1] his wife's uncle, rendered him aid by sending him a hundred bezants every week.

The crafty Gentiles were sometimes favourably disposed towards the Christians, but perish for ever their accursed faith! Twice during their solemn festivals they dragged from the prison two knights chosen by lot, and binding them to stakes shot their arrows at them till they fell amidst the jeers of the Gentiles.

At this sight the captives were sorely troubled, and preferred a noble death to life in so much misery. In consequence, at the expiration of a year, the Christians roused themselves to a bold enterprise, and one Sunday, when the guards had made a plentiful meal provided by the king, they enticed them to drink till they were intoxicated. As the Pagans fell asleep, the Franks seized their arms, and being joined by the forty Armenian and Syrian Christians who had been long in captivity, slew all the Turks, and having thus disposed of their guards, took posession of the entire fortress. The next day they made a bold irruption into the city, and putting several thousand Pagans to the sword, carried off the booty they pillaged into the castle, the strong fortifications of which protected them for nearly eight months. They then dispatched Josceline and Geoffrey le Grêle, to demand succour from all the Christian states.[1]

About this time, the queen of Jerusalem, who was an Armenian by birth, employed a hundred chosen men of her own race to disguise themselves as Turks in their dress and arms, and endeavour to render assistance to her husband in

[1] Calaat-Gieber, or Calgembar, the castle of Giabar, a fortress near the Euphrates.

[2] It would be a vain task to endeavour to separate the history from the romance of this narrative, which has the same characteristics as that of the deliverance of Bohemond in a former chapter. We know for certain that the captives were delivered by the Armenians in disguise sent by Morphia to their relief. It was during Baldwin's second captivity, and not his first, that Josceline and Geoffrey le Grêle made their escape, as Ordericus himself concurs in stating a little further on. As for the particulars of their escape, they must be left on the authority of our author. Modern writers have attached too little credit to these narratives, in which there is probably a good deal of truth. Their rejection of them is the less excusable, as they have nothing to offer instead.

his captivity. These men coming to Karpout, were admitted into the castle, and being well versed in the language and manners of the Turks rendered great assistance to the Franks.

Josceline and Geoffrey, having to explore a road with which they were unacquainted, and fearing, in a strange country, all alike as enemies, chanced to fall in with a peasant who, with his wife mounted on a little ass, was journeying from Mesopotamia to Syria. As they travelled and talked together, the peasant soon recognized Josceline, who, though a valiant warrior, became so alarmed at the barbarian's assertion, that he told him he was under a mistake. The Pagan however said to him: "Your denial is useless, brave knight, for I know you are Josceline, formerly my own master; I have been often employed in your household, and was glad to do the bidding of your humblest servants. I fetched water and lit fires, receiving from your bounty food and clothing like the rest of your domestics. After some years, I went among my Turkish relations, and am now leaving them again, infidels as they are, intending to rejoin the Christians, under whom I lived more happily than with my own kinsmen and country folk. I have heard, worthy sir, of your misfortunes, and long and heartily grieved at the disaster which befel you and your friends. Now that you are released from captivity and on the way to your own country, I will be your faithful attendant, and guide you on the road to Antioch." The Pagan conversing in this manner, with much more to the same purpose, Josceline was highly delighted with his companion. They forthwith exchanged clothes, the barbarian taking the lead as master, and conversing with those they met on the road, while the two Christian knights followed like vile slaves, silently praying to the King of Sabaoth for their mutual safety. They cheerfully carried in their arms by turns the Saracen's little daughter, who was six years old, and thus passed through the fortified places and towns without being recognized.

Listen now to what befel those who were left in extreme peril at Karpout. There were three of Balad's wives concealed in the castle, whose existence the Christians did not discover for fifteen days. Fatima, daughter of Ali, king of the Medes, was the most distinguished of these ladies for

beauty and rank; the second was the daughter of Roduan of Aleppo, and the third of the emir of Caloiambar. The daughter of Roduan wrote a letter to her husband who was besieging Sardanas with a hundred thousand troops, and fastening it to the neck of a carrier-pigeon, let loose the bird from the summit of the tower. In this letter she gave a particular account of the seizure of the castle, the massacre of the guards, and the devastation of the country. As soon therefore as Balad received this intelligence, he raised the siege of Sardanas in violent alarm, and returning hastily to Karpout collected forces from all quarters and blockaded it during eight months.

At this time Josceline and his companions passed through the camp of Balad without being recognized, and arriving at home richly rewarded his guide. Causing the whole family to be regenerated in the waters of baptism, he conferred great wealth on the husband and wife, and, as for the girl he had carried in his arms and thus passed undiscovered through the gentile tribes, he espoused her honorably to a Christian knight.[1]

Balad besieged Karpout for a long time with a numerous army, but Baldwin and his followers gallantly resisted all their attacks. The citadel contained a number of spacious and elegant apartments, and chambers within the main walls in which vast treasures were deposited, consisting of gold and silver, precious stones, purple and silk, and all kinds of valuables. A plentiful stream of water, led from the Euphrates by a subterranean canal of admirable construction, supplied abundantly the wants of those who were shut up in the castle. It contained also stores of bread, wine, and meat, both fresh and salted, sufficient for the support of a thousand soldiers for ten years. Thus the indomitable Franks could confidently rely on maintaining their position until Josceline's return with a reinforcement of Christians.

In consequence, Balad in great anxiety repeatedly sent

[1] "Il fallait que cette jeune fille de six ans eût grandi bien vite."—*Le Prevost.* But every one knows that in the east girls are betrothed in childhood and marriageable at a very early age. The author may have anticipated an event which did not take place for a few years, in order to wind up his romantic story, and dispose of the inferior characters in his drama according to the approved fashion.

able ambassadors to King Baldwin, who made great offers sometimes accompanied by severe reproaches. "O king," he said, "you are guilty of a foul deed, which will stain your honour in the present and future generations. Much to your shame, you treat with cruelty and outrage the feelings of noble matrons, in a manner unbecoming your royal dignity and Christian profession. Why do you detain my helpless wives, who have never done you an injury, confined like captives in the castle? Why do you bind in fetters princesses of royal birth like thieves or traitors? Your conduct is the deepest disgrace to your nation, and will reflect dishonour on your religion throughout all ages. Harden not your heart, I beseech you, but have compassion on my grey hairs, and the feebleness of women. I entreat you to restore me my wives, and I will engage by a solemn oath that I will make no attack on you and your companions for a whole year, in order that Josceline the bearer of your message may have time to return with the relief you need. Meanwhile, if you grant me the favour of sending back my wives, I will draw off my forces, and attend to the administration of my affairs, while you will enjoy the peace I grant for the appointed term. You shall enjoy the liberty of the markets throughout my territories, and you can freely use for that purpose the vast treasure belonging to me which chance has placed in your power. Gazis, Bursethin, and other persons of rank conveyed this message to King Baldwin, and used all their eloquence to persuade him to come to terms with their own prince.

Baldwin assembled all who were in the castle, and laying before them Balad's proposals, demanded their advice. Various opinions being offered, and there being much difficulty in arriving at a positive determination on so doubtful a subject, the queen Fatima thus addressed the assembly: "I perceive, brave men, that you hesitate what reply you shall send to my lord's propositions. I beseech you therefore to listen to what I have to say. Give no heed to my lord's promises, for they are not to be trusted. All the offers by which he endeavours to wheedle you are treacherous. As long us you hold possession of this impregnable castle, and detain me and my companions in your custody, there is no doubt but Balad will be afraid of you, and not venture to

assault the fortress. He well knows, and often declares in the company of his intimate friends, that should any evil happen to us while he is attacking you, he will be afterwards exposed to endless hostilities. All our relations, who are lords of the greatest part of the East, would rise in arms against him, and never rest till they had put him to death. Wait then until you receive the succour of Heaven and your faithful friends, and beware prudently of the dangerous wiles of your crafty foe. You position is commanding, and enables you to repel assaults by hurling darts and stones on the enemy. What is wanting, if you are only firm? You are well furnished with arms, and abundantly provisioned. You have in this impregnable fortress bread, water, wine, and flesh-meat. Call to mind the ten years' siege of Troy, and think of the heroic deeds which your actors daily represent before you, and let such recollections supply you with strength and animate your courage.[1] Fight bravely according to the custom of the Franks, and persevere until you have gained the victory, lest your shame be told in songs throughout the world. Hitherto the glory of the warriors of the West is universally celebrated, and the fame of the Franks has even penetrated to the Persian realms. It does not grieve us to be confined with you, although King Balad taunts you with it as a thing to be ashamed of. We prefer such incarceration to the worship of demons with idolators, and willingly adopting your kindly manners are favourably disposed to your faith and religion, hoping that if, through the divine favour, we safely make our escape from hence in your company, we shall speedily be admitted to the heavenly sacraments of the Christians."

The other princesses heartily agreed with what Fatima had said; and the exhortations of the foreign women pleasing the Christains, they were encouraged to persist for a long while in holding the castle. At length, however, King Baldwin yielded to the prayers and promises of Balad, and restored him his three wives, much against their own wishes, escorted by five brave knights. Having conducted them to Balad, becomingly attired, the knights proposed returning to their

[1] "Voila encore," observes M. Le Prevost, "une veritable Sultane d'opera comique, bien versée en outre dans la connoissance des chansons de geste, et particulièrement de celles qui roulaient sur la guerre de Troie."

friends in the castle, but were detained by the tyrant to the grief of many. Thus Guiumar the Breton, Grevase of Dol, Robert of Caen, Musched of Mans, and Rivallon of Dinan, were made prisoners by the treacherous Balad and presented as captives to Ali, king of the Medes. He was a very powerful prince, and having detained the Franks and treated them honourably nine months, gave them to the caliph of Bagdad.[1] On the morrow, the soldan received them from the caliph, and shortly setting them at liberty loaded them with presents. There the four knights chose Guiumar, son of Count Alan, their leader, and took service with the soldan for three years and a half, returning to Antioch in the course of the fourth year.[2]

The merciful God did not leave his faithful children without aid in their exile, for the five knights of whom we have spoken and who were led so far in captivity, found great favour among the barbarians. The king of the Medes placed them under the care of the governor of the city, ordering that they should come to him every day dressed in the French fashion. They had garments of silk embroidered with gold, horses, arms, and all sorts of furniture, and whatever they chose to ask of the king or the governor. They were objects of wonder to the Persians, and the Medes regarded with admiration the dress of the Franks. Kings' daughters were struck with their handsome persons and smiled at their pleasantries, and kings and princes wished to have descendants of the blood of the Franks. No one however compelled them to change their religion in the slightest degree, or depart from the worship of Christ.

They tell wonderful stories of the soldan's wealth and of the strange curiosities they saw in the east. The word soldan means sole-lord, because he rules over all the princes of the east. In the fourth year, he gave them permission to return home, and presented them with a golden arrow, as

[1] Mostarchid was caliph of Bagdad at this time, 1118—September 28, 1135.

[2] Our author, as usual, is not fortunate in his chronology. He makes the Christian prisoners spend three years and a half in their travels; in the fourth they find Balak besieging Monbec, and still keeping Baldwin in close confinement. But we know that he was not taken prisoner for the first time before the year 1123, and that Josceline slew Balak with his own hand in the spring of 1124.

a token of their liberty being restored by the prince. He offered them the daughters of his most powerful nobles, with immense riches and posessions, if they chose to remain; but as they were resolved to depart, he showed them his vast treasures and wealth of all kinds. At last, having been loaded with gifts, and taken leave of their acquaintance and benefactors, they returned to Antioch under the conduct of David, king of Georgia, and Thorold de Montanis,[1] and joyfully related to their friends how they had lived in Nineveh, Bagdad, and Babylonia, and the many strange things they had seen in the countries of the East.

They heard at Antioch that Balad was besieging Monbec, and still kept King Baldwin in close confinement, after putting to death all his companions. Josceline, after his escape from prison, had sent trusty messengers to the emperor John,[2] and the Greeks and Armenians, and after eight months hastened with a large body of troops to the relief of the king who, as before related, was left in the castle of Karpout. Meanwhile Balad had continued the siege and frequently sent Gazis his nephew, and the young Bursechinus,[3] the commander of his forces, to Baldwin, assuring him on oath that if he would surrender the castle peaceably he should have liberty to depart where he would with all his followers, and receive from him whatever he demanded. The king, weary of his long confinement and too easily trusting the treacherous pagan, surrendered the citadel, to the scandal of the Christians and great joy of the infidels. The king having marched out, Balad ordered four of his teeth to be extracted,[4] and Waleran de Puiset's left eye to

[1] We find no account of the king of Georgia mentioned by our author. As for the prince of Armenia, who appears here under the disguise of a Norman name, he must have been Thoros, brother, lieutenant, and successor, after the year 1185, of Leon, Levon, or Livon. Both were sons of Gabriel, prince of Melitene, as they were brothers of Morphia, queen of Jerusalem, and wife of Baldwin II. These princes of Armenia were called by the western nations, *de Montanis*, from the mountainous character of their territories. The impregnable castle which was their usual residence, stood at the distance of an easy day's journey from Antioch, and they were consequently in continual contact with the lords of that principality.

[2] The emperor John Comnenus, August 15, 1118—April 8, 1143.

[3] The same person we have already met with under the name of *Bursethinus*. See before, p. 399.

[4] We trust the reader will not attach more credit to the extraction of

be pulled out, and the nerves of his right arm to be severed, so that he might no longer carry a lance. Their companions were sentenced to lose their heads: all which was carried into execution. Waleran died from the injuries he received; the king was again thrown into prison, where during four years his sufferings were greater than before; and twenty-four knights and one hundred and forty Syrians or Armenians were put to death by being beheaded. May they live with Christ, whose confessors they were and whom they served in this life! Josceline, having learnt on his way the king's surrender and the slaughter of his late fellow prisoners, halted his troops, and the whole Christian army joined in lamentations; then after a consultation it disbanded. The intelligence of their disaster being spread in all quarters, the Christians were overwhelmed with sorrow, and the Gentiles triumphed with excessive joy.

Balad, finding that all which we have related succeeded to his wishes, and that the Christians throughout Syria and Palestine made a firm resistance without thinking of their king, sent messengers to the kings and emirs throughout the Gentile world. Having united their forces to his, he again laid siege to Monbec. Josceline and all the Christians rejoiced at receiving this intelligence, and lost no time in assembling to give them battle. At this juncture, by the will of our Saviour, the five illustrious knights were in the army, having returned the same week from captivity among the barbarians. A great battle was fought on the vast plain between Monbec and Castle-Trehaled, in which Musci and Heron his brother, and several other emirs, engaged on the side of Balad, and strove to the utmost to defeat the Christians. Balad on the field of battle sent two ass-loads of gold to Godfrey the Monk, count de Mareis,[1] begging him to

four of Baldwin's teeth, than to our author's etymology of the word soldan. After Balak's death, Baldwin remained prisoner at Charan, and was released from his captivity by being ransomed in 1125.

[1] We have no information relative to this person. He may have been the father or kinsman of "Reynold de Mares," who was slain with the prince of Antioch in a battle against the Turks, the 27th of June, 1158." —*Hist. de la Maison de Courtenay*, p. 9. However that may be, it is not true that Balak fell by his hand, but he was killed by Josceline. "La tête du farouche enemi des Chrétiens fut portée en triomphe devant les murs de Tyr, ou ce spectacle doubla l'enthousiasme belliqueux des assiégeants."—*Hist. des Croisades*, ii. 70.

retire alone from the battle, lest both of them should fall that day. For his sister, who was a skilful sorceress, had read in the stars that Godfrey and Balad should slay each other in the fight, and had sent in alarm a message to her brother warning him to take precautions for his safety. The religious count spurned the tyrant's gifts like dross, and offered himself willingly to the sacrifice in the confession of Christ. Having avenged the blood of the saints by slaying Balad, he fell himself gloriously fighting for Christ. His pennon was found on the corpse of Balad, by whose death a dreadful and heavy yoke was removed from the necks of the Christians. In that battle nine hundred Christian soldiers fought against three hundred thousand Pagans, and conquered them by the powerful aid of the mighty God of Israel. On the side of the Christians only six knights and eleven foot-soldiers fell in the battle, while thirteen thousand of the Pagans perished, whose names were found written in Balad's muster-rolls. The Almighty Emanuel, son of the immaculate Virgin, gave strength and victory to his Israelites, filling them with joy at the defeat of their enemies whom he had employed to chastise their offences like a rod of iron; and after the storms of their affliction were dispersed, gave them prosperity and peace. The Lord thundering from heaven broke the horns of the Gentiles, and the Christians lifted up their hands and gave praises to the invincible King of Sabaoth.

The Emir Gazis, nephew and heir of Balad, king of Aleppo, succeeded him;[1] but his recent disasters and diminution of wealth prevented him from undertaking great enterprises and withstanding the difficulties in which his predecessor, taught by long experience, had been involved, and which his fertile genius enabled him to conduct and support. In consequence Gazis, accepting fifty thousand bezants for the ransom of King Baldwin, released him from prison, requiring forty youths, chosen from the principal families of Jerusalem, or the neighbouring provinces, as hostages for the restoration of all the Pagans who were in captivity among the faithful. These terms having been agreed to, he released the king, and waited at the appointed time near the castle of Gis in the country of Cæsarea Philippi. The Christians

[1] Balak's successor was not called Gazis, and was not his nephew. It was Timourtasch, son of Yl-Gazi, and he was already king of Maredin.

arrived there with the money stipulated for the king's ransom, and making a bold attack in the name of Christ, took the emir and the castle, and recovering their hostages, returned to Jerusalem with joyful thanksgivings to God. Gazis redeemed himself by paying one hundred thousand golden bezants, and engaged to maintain a durable peace with the Christians; but his sovereignty was of short duration.[1]

CH. XXVII. *Siege of Tyre by the crusaders from Jerusalem, and the Venetians—On its surrender, an Englishman appointed archbishop—A church built on the spot where our Lord preached.*

WHILE King Baldwin was detained a prisoner, as we have now related, and the Christians almost despaired of his deliverance, the bishop exhorted the clergy and people of Jerusalem not to faint in their tribulations, but trusting in Christ to oppose the Gentiles resolutely, and enlarge their borders by force of arms to the Creator's glory. Envoys were therefore despatched to Italy, who summoned to their aid the duke of Venice with a powerful fleet. Tyre, a city famous both in sacred and profane history, was then invested both by sea and land, and the siege was pressed till it was forced to surrender.[2] When at last the place was taken, a certain clerk, who was a native of England, was ordained bishop,[3] and a

[1] All that our author relates of the circumstances attending the liberation of Baldwin is the subject of controversy. It is a fact that in 1125 Timourtasch lost Aleppo, which was besieged by Baldwin, and it was given up to his liberator, the sultan of Mossoul; but he retained the kingdom of Maredin and Miafarehin until his death in 1152.

Baldwin, whose imprisonment only dated from the month of February, 1123, was released by ransom the 29th of August, 1124. The kingdom of Jerusalem was administered during his captivity by Eustace Garnier, lord of Cesarea and Sidon.

[2] Tyre was taken on the 7th of July, 1124, after a siege of five months and a half. The doge of Venice, who assisted in its reduction, was Dominico Michaele, 1117—1130.

[3] A person named Odo was nominated by Baldwin II. to be the Latin archbishop of Tyre as early as 1122. He appears to have been consecrated by the patriarch Gormond, but never took possession of his see, as the city was in the hands of the infidels when he died in 1124. After the place was taken, the king and patriarch, with the nobles of the kingdom, assembled in 1127, the fourth year after Odo's death, and by universal concurrence raised to the archiepiscopal dignity, "William, a venerable

church built, under the invocation of St. Saviour, outside the city, on the spot where the Lord Jesus preached to the people the word of eternal salvation.[1] The altar was constructed of a large stone on which our Lord sat while he was teaching; not having been willing to enter a city of the uncircumcized, lest he should seem to give an occasion of scandal to the Jews, if He, being a Hebrew, should enter a city of the Gentiles and have any intercourse with them. The faithful collected the fragments which the masons chipped off from this shapeless stone, and, from reverence to our Lord's seat, carried them into various countries, where they are deposited in consecrated places among holy relics.

CH. XXVIII. *Negotiations between the court of Constantinople, and afterwards that of Jerusalem, for a marriage with the heiress of Antioch.*

A CERTAIN Greek of high rank, named Ravendinos, arrived at Antioch, and brought a message from the emperor Alexius[2] to Prince Roger already mentioned, demanding his daughter in marriage for John, the emperor's son. The hostility he had long fostered had gradually abated, in consequence of that sagacious monarch having reflected that the common lot of mortals had carried of Bohemond and Tancred, and other rebels, and that he had reason to apprehend that the same fate speedily threatened himself. He, there-

man, a native of England, where he was prior of St. Sepulchre's, and of worthy life and conduct."—*William of Tyre*, l. xiii. c. 23. The good intelligence subsisting between the two prelates did not last long, for in the course of the same year the archbishop, in opposition to the will of his patriarch, went to Rome to demand the *pallium*, which was granted him by Honorius II. He died in 1132 or 1133. Tyre, in the thirteenth century, was called by the Franks *Sur*, derived from Tyr, by introducing the *s*, *Tsur*.

[1] Matt. xv. 21. Mark vii. 24.

The gospels appear to bear out the statement that our Lord's discourse with the Syro-Phœnician woman was held outside the city; but the precise spot, and the circumstance of his having seated himself during it on a particular stone, rest on local tradition.

[2] Our author forgets that Alexius died the 15th of August, 1118, and Roger in 1119. There is another circumstance which exhibits the incorrectness of the present narrative. Baldwin I. left no posterity, and those of Baldwin II. were not cotemporaries with the emperor Alexius. It will appear in the sequel that Ordericus speaks of the latter.

fore, determined to form an alliance of one of his family with that warlike race,[1] that at least his heir might recover the principality of Antioch by the rights of marriage, as he despaired of accomplishing it by force of arms. He, therefore, employed in the embassy to the Normans the Greek already mentioned, who, while he was waiting for a reply to his message, met with a serious disaster. For, being thus detained at Antioch until an honourable answer was agreed on in a general assembly, the emir Gazis, the Persian, made a sudden irruption, as I have already related, into the territories of the Christians, and Ravendinos, accompanying Roger against the enemy, was taken prisoner and compelled to pay fifteen thousand bezants for his ransom. The Turks would not do him any injury because he was a Greek, sparing him from their knowledge of his nation, which was a neighbour of theirs, and from their respect for the emperor; so that having received the ransom they dismissed him in safety. The ambassador, finding that Roger and all his troops had perished, and that King Baldwin had united the principality of Antioch to the kingdom of Jerusalem, went to him on the part of the emperor, and demanded his daughter in marriage for his son John. King Baldwin received the message with great satisfaction, and, consenting to the proposal, sent the ambassador to Jerusalem to see his daughter, furnishing him with a secret despatch addressed to the queen only. Ravendinos accordingly proceeded to Jerusalem, and was well received by the queen and her daughter, the king's commands being cheerfully obeyed. The beautiful princess, appearing in public, was the delight of all beholders, and she herself, having heard tidings of her happy prospects, cherished fruitless hopes. Indeed, nothing is stable but that which the only Creator of all things orders by his providence. The emperor's ambassador, with his

[1] It was not Alexius Comnenus who wished to marry his son John to the heiress of Antioch, but John who proposed the alliance for his son Manuel, who was born in 1120. Irritated by the preference given to Raymond, that emperor invaded Cilicia, and then turned his arms against the prince of Armenia, the ally of the prince of Antioch.

These events appear to have occurred between the years 1135 and 1137. It is, therefore, not impossible that some imperfect account of them may have reached Ordericus before he concluded his history.

attendants and the companions of his journey, sailed to the island of Cyprus, the duke of which, resolving to accompany him to Constantinople in fifteen days, commanded them all to be hospitably entertained until Whitsuntide. Lodgings were assigned them in a handsome mansion at some distance from the palace, and while they anxiously waited for the appointed time, they were supplied abundantly with provisions at the duke's expense.

Meanwhile, he was assassinated in his own apartments during a general insurrection, and a plank was removed from each of the ships which were moored on the sea shore. The bloody homicides also fixed and published the day on which the envoy and his fellow travellers should be put to death, but impediments were adroitly raised, and it was frequently postponed by a prudent man who was in the conspirators' counsels. He said: "I beseech you, friends and brothers, to spare these men for your own sakes, and refrain from dipping your hands in the blood of those who have done you no injury. Guide your actions by discretion and the rule of right, lest you exasperate God and man against you by the enormity of your crimes, and incur the vengeance of the greatest princes on all sides. You have already perpetrated an abominable outrage against the emperor in having murdered in the night his cousin, one of the dukes of the empire of Constantinople. As yet you may shelter yourselves against his anger under the protection of the king of Jerusalem, against whom you have hitherto committed no offence. But if you give umbrage to the magnanimous Frank who rules at Jerusalem, and are threatened with war on both sides, what will you do? Where will you find refuge?" By such words as these, the prudent nobleman restrained the fury of the fierce rebels, who could hardly restrain their bloody hands from the massacre of the innocents; and with great difficulty he obtained permission for their departure about the feast of St. John.

At last, they obtained leave to embark in two old ships, and, after incurring great risks in a voyage of several days, landed in Illyrium, from whence they pursued their journey in greater security to Byzantium, through the cities celebrated in the verses of the poets, namely, Athens, the mother of eloquence and the inventrix of liberal arts, and

Thebes, the nurse of tyrants, who breathed only civil war.[1] Ravendinos reported to those who had commissioned him melancholy intelligence of the events of his embassy, and, on the other hand, learnt that many changes had taken place in his own country. During the interval, King Baldwin had been made prisoner by Balad, as I have already related. The emperor Alexius having died shortly before, his son John mounted the imperial throne. In such altered circumstances, the overtures for the proposed alliance were entirely abandoned.

Ch. XXIX. *Bohemond II. assumes the government of the principality of Antioch—His untimely death in battle.*

Constance, the illustrious daughter of Philip, king of France, had a son by Bohemond, who was educated by her with great care at Tarentum, in Italy, and duly kept under her maternal guardianship until he arrived at the age of puberty. The young Bohemond, who was naturally endowed with excellent qualities, grew up worthily, and on his attaining manhood was invested with knightly arms amidst general demonstrations of joy. Emulous of his father's glory, he studied to imitate his courage and conduct, and led those who observed him to expect great things from the indications he gave of virtue and valour. The people of Antioch, having heard of this during King Baldwin's captivity for six years[2] in Balad's dungeons at Karpout, sent frequent messages, inviting the lawful heir to cross the sea in security, and, landing in Syria, take possession of his father's principality with the good will of his subjects. However, he was detained by his mother's anxieties until the king was released from captivity, as already stated. At last, Baldwin, learning the wishes of the inhabitants of Antioch, and believing that from the influence of his father's name it would be advantageous to the people, he offered his daughter in marriage to Bohemond, with the advice of his nobles, and invited him to take possession of his father's duchy without delay. In consequence the amiable young

[1] Our author again alludes to the story of Œdipus, more distinctly referred to before, p. 377.

[2] It has already appeared that these six years must be reduced to eighteen months.

prince embarked, with universal prayers offered to God on his behalf, and, crossing the sea to Antioch, assumed his father's principality amidst general rejoicings, and married Baldwin's daughter, who bore him a daughter. Established in his government, he ruled his subjects with a gentle sway, but made war on the Gentiles, and fell, alas! after a short reign of scarcely three years, when he was suddenly cut off to the great grief and loss of his friends and people.[1]

Dissensions having arisen between the Christian princes, Bohemond and Leo the Armenian, the blood of the faithful flowed in this accursed quarrel, and the Gentiles gained a triumphant victory. This Leo was son of Thorold de Montanis,[2] and uncle of Bohemond's wife, and the young prince assembled an army to attack him, and led it into the enemy's country. Having reached the banks of the Euphrates, where he pitched his camp, an Armenian brought him intelligence that the emir Sanguin[3] was at hand with a vast body of Turks, and was on the point of an irruption into the Christian territories. Bohemond at first gave little heed to the news, but being desirous of ascertaining its correctness, and unwilling to trust the reports of others, he left his camp, and putting himself at the head of two hundred youthful troops, climbed to the summit of a mountain to make his observations. From this eminence he discovered seven companies of foragers, forming the van of the enemy's army. Holding them cheap, he instantly charged them, and, after a sharp engagement, put them nearly all to the sword, with the loss, however, of his whole party, except twenty knights. Meanwhile the main body of the enemy came up, and the survivors perceiving their vast numbers, and that their impetuous leader was astounded by grief and surprise, they cried out to him with earnest intreaty: "Lose no time in rejoining your troops, range them in order of

[1] Correcting the calculations according to the preceding note, we may fix the arrival of Bohemond II. in Palestine about the year 1125 or 1126, and as he did not fall in battle till 1130, it is not correct to state that he governed his principality scarcely three years.

[2] This prince of Armenia was not a son of Thoros, but of Gabriel prince of Melitene, as already observed. Queen Morphia was his sister, and Moros his eldest brother.

[3] Emadeddin Zenghi, sultan of Mossoul and Aleppo. This event took place in 1130, as we have just had occasion to remark.

battle, and, attacking the enemy, gallantly defend your country." Bohemond refused to follow their advice, preferring, after the loss of his comrades, death to flight. Thus the beardless youth rushed against a host, and fell fighting in the cause of Christ.[1] Some few who found means of escaping forded the Euphrates, and bore the sad tidings of the death of the duke to their companions in arms. The whole army then immediately dispersed, retiring in bodies to their fortified places, and putting the province in a state of defence against the Gentiles.

Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, on learning the death of his son-in-law, proceeded by hasty marches at the head of his troops to oppose the pagans in Syria. Being welcomed by the faithful in that region, he defended the whole country against the enemy, retaining possession of the principality of Antioch for a long period, and bequeathing it to his successor, Fulk of Anjou, whom he had made his heir.[2]

I have collected these accounts of the faithful soldiers of Christ who for his sake are exiles in the East, simply and truly committing to writing for the information of posterity the particulars which I have learnt from those who were present at these transactions. I now return to my narrative of affairs in Italy, France, Spain, England, and Flanders.

Ch. XXX. *King Henry regulates affairs in Normandy—The abbey church of Fécamp rebuilt—Succession of the abbots.*

In the year of our Lord 1107, the fifteenth indiction, Henry king of England,[3] having reduced Normandy to submission by the success of his arms, frequently summoned to his court those who had jurisdiction over the people, and prudently warned them against the tumults and hostilities in which

[1] We have no other details of the defeat and death of Bohemond II. than those added to our author's short account in note to p. 393. The narrative, herefore, rests on the authority of Ordericus.

[2] Fulk of Anjou, Baldwin's successor, administered the principality of Antioch until the year 1137, when he invited to the east Raymond de Poitiers, youngest son of William IX., to marry Constance, daughter and heiress of Bohemond II.

[3] We now return to the affairs of the West, with a satisfaction which will probably be participated by the reader.

they had been engaged, admonishing all, both with entreaties and threats, to observe the rules of justice.

In the month of January there was a meeting at Falaise, in the king's presence, of the principal persons of that neighbourhood. During this assembly, Robert, abbot of Caen, was seized with a sudden disorder and gave up the ghost. Eudes, a monk of the same abbey, filled his place for several lustres.[1]

In the month of March, also, the king held a meeting at Lisieux, and with the advice of the nobles made a variety of edicts to meet the wants of the commons, his subjects; and thus allaying the evils of war, restored order in Normandy by his royal authority.[2] William de Ros, third abbot of Fécamp, fell sick while returning from this assembly, and died happily before the end of the same month.[3] This venerable man was eminent for his good conduct and worth. From his childhood his sweet disposition expanded in virtues of all kinds, and both as a clerk and a monk he shone in the sight of men as a mirror of good works. He was raised to the government of his convent while yet a novice in the monastic order, and administered it nearly twenty-seven years, during which he made great improvements both within and without. He pulled down the chancel of the old church erected by Duke Richard, and replaced it by a building in an improved style of exquisite beauty and of increased proportions, both in length and breadth. He also enlarged the nave of the church with great elegance, where the chapel of St. Fromond stands; and when the works were at last completed he procured their consecration by Archbishop William and four other bishops, on the seventeenth of the calends of July[4] [15th June]. At his death he was interred before the

[1] Robert I., abbot of St. Stephen at Caen, is only known by the short notice here given by our author. His successor, Eudes, governed the abbey truly, for "many lustres," as he held it until 1140.

[2] This meeting at Lisieux must not be confounded with that mentioned by our author not long before, see p. 383. There was an interval of five months between them. The acts of the second council are lost, as well as those of the first.

[3] On the 26th of March, 1107; not 1108, as the editors of the *Gallia Christiana* state.

[4] The 15th of June, 1106.

altar of the glorious Virgin Mary in the new building he had caused to be constructed.[1]

Many illustrious and learned men, inspired with love of the kind abbot, flocked to Fécamp, and in that school of divine worship served with reverence under his rule the holy and undivided Trinity. His faithful and devoted disciples composed many pieces to his memory both in prose and verse, but the remarkable epitaph written by Hildebert, bishop of Mans,[2] was selected and engraved in letters of gold on his tomb.

> Here FECAMP's pious abbot, WILLIAM's days were blessed,
> His body only, earth, his wealth the poor possessed,
> Bending his way from Egypt's barren waste,
> He sought Jerusalem with eager haste;[3]
> Made war with vice, was virtue's constant friend,
> The fight, the concord, keeping to the end.
> Six days before the clouds of April lowered,
> He gave his soul to heaven, his dust to earth restored.

Adelelm, a monk of Flavigni,[4] who had long lived at Fécamp with universal respect, and was deeply erudite in the twin sciences of sacred and profane literature, was firmly attached to Abbot William until the end of his life by the ties of an ardent affection, as may be seen in the able works he published. He inscribed his memoirs with great eloquence on the rolls of the abbey of Fécamp,[5] adapting to his venerable life the brilliant flowers of holy writ, insomuch that tears of loving regard were drawn from the eyes of those who perused

[1] Only a small portion of the works constructed by Abbot de Ros at Fécamp now remain. The nave was rebuilt in the thirteenth century, and the chapel of the Virgin in the fifteenth or sixteenth, as well as all the south side of the choir; but it is probable that we may attribute to him several of the arches on the north of the choir, and perhaps a semicircular chapel on the same side.

[2] Respecting this prelate, see before, p. 227.

[3] M. Dubois considers these lines to be figurative of Abbot William's appeal to the pope against the intrigues of the archbishop of Rouen. We conclude that they rather express in language borrowed from scripture the pious abbot's zeal to quit the world, devoting himself to a life of religion, with the holy city in prospect.

[4] *L'Histoire littéraire de la France*, ix. 386—388.

[5] On the subject of the Mortuary Rolls, see a *Mémoire*, by M. Leopold Delisle, entitled: *Des Monuments paléographiques concernant l'usage de prier pour les morts.—Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 11. série, t. iii.

them. In this work, it is not merely, I think, human genius which is so happily displayed, but heavenly grace has manifested to the gentle readers those inspirations with which it gloriously adorned the faithful guardians of the spouse of Christ, for the profit of multitudes, and permitted him to shine in this world like a light set in a candlestick. Many of the readers shed pious tears on the roll, and, marvelling at the gifts of divine grace, offered mournful prayers to God for the soul of his faithful servant. Hildebert composed three elegiac couplets, which I rejoice to have an opportunity of inserting, in memory of the devoted servant of the Almighty.

> William de Ros, an honoured name,
> Left in the church a triple fame:
> Bayeux beheld him spurning wealth,
> And Caen seeking ghostly health,
> Taught in her holy discipline;
> While grateful Fécamp's stately shrine
> Reflects the glory all his own
> She borrowed from his great renown.
> Six days before the April sun,
> Life's struggle ceased and heaven begun.

Soon after the death of this father, Roger of Bayeux[1] was elected abbot, and consecrated on the twelfth of the calends of January [21st December], by William the aged metropolitan.[2] He was the fourth abbot of Fécamp. The first was William de Dijon,[3] who organized the society with piety and skill in the time of Duke Richard; he was succeeded by John the Italian, who governed it fifty one-years.[4] The third abbot was William of Bayeux, who for his great modesty was surnamed Puella, and having received the profession of his successor in the monastic order taught what it would be one day his turn to teach. Then the aged prelate ordained Roger and one hundred and twenty other priests on the feast of St. Thomas the Apostle, and on the following day gave Roger the benediction belonging to the office of abbot, at Rouen.

[1] Robert d'Argences, December 21, 1107—March 22, 1138 or 1139.

[2] William Bonne-Ame, archbishop of Rouen.

[3] The holy William de Dijon, 1001—1028. Our author appears to have forgotten that, like his successor, he was a native of Italy.

[4] John, first of that name, born in the neighbourhood of Ravenna, (1028—February 21, 1078 or 1079.)

The new-made priest and abbot returned to Fécamp to keep the festival of Christmas, and has now continued in the government of the abbey nearly thirty-two years.[1]

I have spoken more particularly of this ordination, because I was present, and, unworthy as I am, took upon me the burden of the priesthood by the command of the lord Roger, my own abbot.[2] On this occasion great numbers of the clergy assembled at Rouen, and the household of Christ received happily an accession of nearly seven hundred clerks in orders of different degree. Inspired at that time with the fire of youth I wrote some hexameter verses, in which I enumerated in a few lines the number of priests and deacons then ordained.

When holy hands were laid upon my brow,
The office of the priesthood to bestow,
Full fivescore others shared the sacred rite,
Sent forth to combat in the Spirit's might;
Two hundred white-stoled Levites[3] joined the throng,
And while the arches pealed with chant and song,
Sub-deacons forty-four, in less degree,
Received by grace divine, authority
Rightly to minister in holy things,
And serve the altars of the King of kings.[4]

CH. XXXI. *Flambard resigns Lisieux to King Henry and returns to Durham—His successor in the see of Lisieux—Death of Maurice, bishop of London.*

DURING the storms of troubles to which Normandy was exposed for want of a competent ruler, the see of Lisieux, after the death of Gilbert Maminot, its bishop, was long

[1] This passage must have been written in the year 1139.

[2] Our author was ordained deacon by his former abbot, Serlo, who had become bishop of Lisieux, on the 26th of March, 1093, being then of the age of eighteen years. Fifteen years then elapsed, it appears, before he "took upon him the burden of the priesthood." M. Guizot remarks in his introduction to the present work (vol. i., p. ix.), that "all the records of those ancient times concur in informing us with what holy fear truly pious men then regarded the duties of the priesthood, how they shrunk from undertaking them, and often only consented to accept the office upon the express command of their superiors."

[3] Levites, a common name for deacons.

[4] Robert d'Argences died the 22nd of March, 1139(?). Our author was ordained priest at the same time with the abbot, and one hundred and twenty others. Two hundred deacons and only forty-four subdeacons

desolate, and more in the power of wolves than of pastors, lay at the mercy of robbers, having no protectors. When, however, King Henry gained the victory of Tinchebrai, his enemy, Ranulph Flambard, who resided at Lisieux as lord of the place, considering how best he might adroitly escape the consequences of this turn of affairs, despatched in all haste messengers to Henry, while he was rejoicing in his recent triumph, and, humbly imploring his favour, offered, if peace was granted him, to give up the city which he held to the king.[1] That wise prince, who preferred peace to war, always the source of so many calamities, pardoned the pacific bishop his past offences, accepted at once the surrender of Lisieux, and restored to Flambard, with whom he was reconciled, his bishopric of Durham. He gave the see of Lisieux to John, archdeacon of Séez, and having prudently arranged the affairs of Normandy crossed over to England to attend to those of that kingdom.[2]

That archdeacon was the son of a Norman dean, and was educated from childhood in the church of Séez, being cotemporary with Robert, Gerard, and Serlo, bishops of that see, and was distinguished for his ability both in secular and ecclesiastical affairs. For his singular judgment and

having been ordained at the same time, the rest of the seven hundred clerks must have received minor orders. The great number of clergy admitted to ecclesiastical offices at one time was probably the consequence of the distracted state of Normandy for a long period before, and of the countenance and protection now afforded the church by Henry I.

[1] This transaction must have taken place immediately after the battle of Tinchebrai, as in the middle of October Henry came to Lisieux to preside at the assembly of the bishops and nobles.

[2] Our author connects two events, separated by a considerable interval. After Ranulph Flambard's submission, Hervey, bishop of Bangor, under pretext of the devastations committed on the lands belonging to his see, prayed to be translated to Lisieux. The king wrote to St. Anselm on the subject. The archbishop replied that it was a serious affair, and could not be accomplished without the consent of the bishops of the province and the apostolical sanction.

The king returned to England during Lent, bringing with him the prisoners he had taken at the battle of Tinchebrai. He held his court at Windsor on Easter-day, which, we are told, "was attended by the nobles of England and Normandy, with fear and trembling." It was, in fact, the first occasion on which the leopard, now secure of his prey, made them feel his claws. The tone in which he addressed them was very different from his humble and honeyed phrases of the preceding year.

eloquence he was promoted by these bishops to the office of archdeacon, and took his place in the first rank of judicial authorities, managing ecclesiastical affairs with great prudence for many years. At length the fury of Robert de Belèsme burst forth against bishop Serlo, and his animosity included the archdeacon who was the main support of his bishop; Robert therefore began to harass him with fierce threats and persecutions. As the tyrant was at that time at the height of his power, and scarcely any one in Normandy could resist his attacks, the defenceless clerk took refuge in England, and being graciously received by the king, to whom he was already known, he remained there in exile. Appointed one of the king's principal chaplains, he was often summoned to the royal councils among the king's intimate advisers. At last, as I have already mentioned, Henry, becoming attached to him for his intrinsic worth, appointed him to the see of Lisieux. In the month of September, John the deacon was ordained priest by Serlo of Séez, and shortly afterwards he was consecrated bishop by William the metropolitan. Firmly governing his see for nearly thirty-four years,[1] he reformed many things in the church and clergy and people of God.[2]

At the same time died Maurice, bishop of London,[3] a good and pious prelate, in whose time the church of St. Paul the apostle and great part of the city was burnt to the ground. He was succeeded in the see by Richard de Beaumais, viscount of Shrewsbury, who zealously exerted himself in the con-

[1] This appears to have been written at an advanced period of the year 1041.

[2] As already remarked, John, bishop of Lisieux, did not immediately obtain possession of his see. He was not ordained priest by Bishop Serlo till the month of September, 1107, and afterwards consecrated by William Bonne-Ame; so that he had not completed thirty-four years in his bishopric, when he died in the month of May, 1141, as will presently appear.

[3] The 26th of September, 1107. This prelate had been chancellor to William the Conqueror, before he was advanced to the see of London. William of Malmesbury speaks in terms of high admiration of the size of the new cathedral of St. Paul's, begun by Bishop Maurice, in place of the former church, burnt down in 1087. "Such," he says, "was the area of the crypt, and so spacious was the church above, that it seemed as if it would contain any number of people."

struction of the new cathedral begun by his predecessor and nearly completed the works he commenced.[1]

Ch. XXXII. *Death of Richard de Reviers, and Roger Bigod, founder of Thetford priory—His epitaph.*

At that time Richard de Reviers,[2] and Roger surnamed Bigod,[3] barons of England, died and were interred in the monasteries for monks which they had founded on their own domains; Roger being buried at Thetford in England, and Richard at Montebourg in Normandy. The monks of Cluni wrote this epitaph on Roger Bigod.

This little space of earth is all that's left
To Roger Bigod, of his honours reft.
Ah! what avail wealth, honours, eloquence,
Or royal favour, or e'en manly sense!
What enervates the soul like opulence?
Thee, may God's counsels grant a happy fate,
Thee, piety and virtue elevate!

For four-and-twenty nights the God of day
With the bright Virgin wedded, tracked his way,[4]
When thy brave spirit, Roger, passed away.

---

[1] Richard de Beaumais, on the Dive. He often appears as witness to charters relating to the abbey of St. Peter at Shrewsbury, but we never find the title of viscount given him. According to the annals of Winchester he had been attached to the chapel of the count de Belèsme, which seems most probable. See the *Anglia Sacra*, i. 297. After having exhausted all the resources of his see to complete the church begun by his predecessor on so vast a scale, he became so discouraged that he retired to St. Osythe's at Chick, in Essex, where he had founded a priory, of which William de Curboil, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, was the first superior.

[2] Richard de Reviers; see vol. ii., p. 498. Our author is mistaken in representing him as the first founder of the abbey of Montebourg. He only restored the lands which Henry I. had wrested from it and granted to him; adding a new donation. It was founded by William the Conqueror.

[3] Roger Bigot, son of Robert Bigot, a native of the county of Mortain, and one of the witnesses to the charter of foundation of St. Philibert-sur-Risle in 1066. According to the *Monast. Anglic.*, he founded the priory of Thetford in 1103.

[4] *Soli nubebat Virgo ter noctibus octo.* From this fanciful mode of expression we learn that Roger Bigod died the twenty-fourth day after the sun's entrance into the sign of the Virgin, that is to say, on the 15th of September.

CH. XXXIII. *The count of Evreux founds a priory at Noyon—His character and that of his countess—Thorney Abbey—Succession of its abbots.*

WILLIAM, count of Evreux, being advanced in years and justly alarmed at the approach of inevitable death, by the influence of his wife Helvise,[1] determined to erect on his domains a temple to God, in which a chosen body of monks might fitly carry on the war of faith under the King of kings. In consequence, both husband and wife requested the advice and aid of Roger, abbot of St. Evroult,[2] in the matter, and applied for twelve monks by name, to build a monastery at Noyon.[3] The twelve brothers, with Abbot Roger, assembled there on the third of the ides [13th] of October,[4] and began to live a regular life in a desert place called Boucheron,[5] near the chapel of St. Martin the Archbishop.[6] Many persons of different ages, offering themselves for conversion, were well received, and zealously taught the regular course of life, according to the rule of St. Benedict. However, as the seed sown is subject to many injuries before harvest, and all the grains of corn do not flourish or perish alike, but have to struggle through the rains of winter and the summer heats, so men, in their several orders or congregations are exposed to various trials, neither enjoying equal prosperity, nor subject to the same calamities.

In the year of our Lord 1108, the count of Evreux, with his wife, laid the foundations of a spacious church in honour of St. Mary, mother of God, and applied large sums of money out of his own funds towards carrying on the works,

[1] Notwithstanding his advanced age, we have lately seen this nobleman present at the battle of Tinchebrai, as he was forty years before at that of Hastings. His countess, Helvise, was daughter of William I., count of Nevers.

[2] Roger du Sap, abbot of St. Evroult.

[3] Noyon-sur-Andelle. This place has taken the name of Charleval since the time that Charles IX. frequented it, and laid the foundations of a royal residence, the plans and elevations of which are preserved in Du Cerceau's work, *Des Bastiments de France*.

[4] October 13, 1107.

[5] No vestiges of this local name remain in the neighbourhood.

[6] It was only a chapel, as our author states. The parish church has always been dedicated to St. Denys. The buildings of the priory were levelled to admit of the foundation of the chateau of Charles IX., and the monks were sent back to St. Evroult.

but he was prevented from completing them by grievous worldly troubles. Indeed, the count's faculties were naturally somewhat feeble, as well as blunted by age,[1] and, trusting perhaps more than was becoming to his wife's abilities, he left the government of his county entirely in her hands. The countess was distinguished for her wit and beauty; she was one of the tallest women in all Evreux, and of very high birth, being the daughter of William, the illustrious count of Nevers. Disregarding the counsels of her husband's barons, she chose rather to follow her own opinion, and her ambition frequently inspiring bold measures in political affairs, she was easily led to engage in rash enterprises. The earl of Mellent and other Norman lords were little inclined to brook this female presumption, and in consequence they denounced her to the king, and incensed him against her by their bitter accusations. At length, Count William and the countess Helvise, having levelled to the ground the king's donjon at Evreux, and offended him in other matters in which their fealty was not properly observed, he deprived them of their possessions in Normandy, and they were twice compelled to become exiles in Anjou. These troubles caused great hindrances in the work of building the monastery, and the death of both, which speedily followed, was a great loss to many persons. The countess, who died first,[2] reposes at Noyon; the count was afterwards struck with apoplexy, and died without receiving the last sacraments; his mouldering corpse is laid with his father's at Fontenelles.[3]

As the count died without issue, and his nephew Amauri had incurred the royal displeasure by his indiscretion, the king retained the county of Evreux in his own hands. Great mischief resulted from this, as will appear in the sequel; the city and all the country round being exposed to pillage and burning. Meanwhile the monastery which the count had begun building at Noyon has remained unfinished to this day, under the priors Robert, Roger, and Ranulf.

[1] We must not forget that the good lord was nephew of Ralph Iête-d'Ane.

[2] In 1114.

[3] The 16th of April, 1118. Le Brasseur, who supplies this date, says that the count was buried at Fécamp, which is a mistake.

The first of these priors, Robert de Prunières,[1] was the son of Haimon de Prunières, a loyal squire, and was distinguished for his profound erudition among the accomplished philosophers in the schools of the grammarians and dialecticians. The king summoned him from his priory to cross over to England, where he entrusted him with the government of the monastery of Thorney,[2] on the death of Abbot Gunter, and he ruled it ably during twenty years.[3]

Thorney means in English the Island of Thorns, so called because a wood of various sorts of trees is surrounded on all sides by flowing rivulets of deep water.[4] On it stands a monastery of monks dedicated to St. Mary, mother of God, which, secluded from all secular habitations, was distinguished for its pure worship of the Supreme Divinity. It was founded by the venerable Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester, in the time of King Ethelred, who translated to it the remains of St. Botolph, abbot of Ikanhoe,[5] with many other relics of saints, after the massacre by the Danes, in which St. Edmund, king of the East-Angles, fell a martyr in the confession of Christ. The monks only and their servants dwell in the deep recesses of Thorney, where in security they offer faithful service to God. No females

[1] The name was afterwards spelt Purnelai, or Punelai. In Henry I.'s charter to St. Evroult, we read, *S. Gervasius de Pruneleio*, in that of Robert III. of Leicester, *Ecclesiam S. Gervasii de Purneleio*. Anglicè, Purnell. It is now one of the two churches of the commune of des Moutiers en Auge, near Coulibœuf. The other, dedicated to St. Martin, belonged probably to Haimon de Prunelai, Robert's father.

[2] *Torneiæ*. Thorney abbey, in Cambridgeshire. Its primitive name was *Ancraig;* in the charter of foundation by King Edgar in 973, it is called *Thorney*. It is singular that our author, whose practice of introducing the *Th* in words to which it does not belong, as has been frequently remarked, should have always omitted it in this, where it is required.

[3] It was in 1113 that Robert de Prunelai left the priory of Noyon to succeed Gontier of Mans, the first abbot of Thorney. According to a document inserted in the *Monast. Anglic.*, he governed the abbey not twenty, but twenty-six years, 1113—1139.

[4] From the marshy character of the soil, the underwood which gave the name to the island must have mainly consisted of the black thorn, *prunus spinosa*. The abbey of Westminister originally bore the name of Thorney from the same circumstance.

[5] St. Botolph, brother of St. Adulph, bishop, founded the monastery of of Ikanhoe, near Boston, in Lincolnshire (Botulf's Town), towards the middle of the seventh century.

are allowed to enter the island but for the purpose of devotion, nor are they permitted to sojourn there on any pretext whatever, and all dwellings inhabited by women are studiously prohibited by the monks within nine miles from the abbey. After England was conquered by Norman valour, and King William had reduced it to subjection conformably to his own laws, he gave the government of Thorney to Fulcher, a monk of St. Bertin's at Sithin; a man of deep erudition, who administered it for nearly sixteen years without receiving consecration as abbot. He was courteous, pleasant, and charitable, and well skilled in grammar and music. He left to future generations in England some precious monuments of his talents having published several works worthy of memory, containing charming narratives, suited to be sweetly sung, of the lives of St. Oswald, bishop of Worcester,[1] and other saints of English origin. In consequence of disputes with the bishop of Lincoln, he retired, and was succeeded by Gunter of Mans, a monk of Battle Abbey, who had been archdeacon of Salisbury. This abbot introduced the rules of Marmoutier in the government of the convent at Thorney, and erected from the foundation with great industry a most elegant church, with lodgings for the monks, where, being interred by his faithful disciples, he now reposes. The following short epitaph composed on him will convey to the reader in a few verses the knowledge of his character:—

> Here in the abbey, which his care restored,
> Lies GONTIER, ancient THORNEY's mitred lord;
> His care for six-and-twenty years to rule
> And guide his flock in virtue's holy school.
> He built this church, and by such works of love
> Strove to obtain a place in realms above.
> To him—who died in August, happily,
> The fifteenth calend—Christ propitious be![2]

[1] St. Oswald, bishop of Worcester in 960, and archbishop of York in 972, holding it with his former see. He died the 28th of February, 992, and was buried in the cathedral of Worcester, which he built. He was a great patron of the monks.

[2] In this epitaph, Abbot Gontier of Mans, monk of Battle abbey, is represented as having presided at Thorney abbey only twenty-six years. In the document before cited, he appears to have governed it twenty-eight, 1085—1113.

Robert, his successor, was his superior in learning, and became celebrated among the most eminent prelates of England for his constancy and eloquence. As for Roger, who succeeded him as prior of Noyon, he spent nearly twenty-four years in carrying on the new works and furthering the interests of his monks. At last, he took to his bed, and, being well prepared, died on the twelfth of the calends of January [December 21st]. One of his friends sung of him these short verses:—

Fourth of Noyon's[1] reverend priors,
Gathered to his worthy sires
On St. Thomas' festal day
Roger's spirit passed away.
Studying grammar in his youth,
Still intent on sacred truth,
From the fleeting world he sped
And a life of virtue led,
Sheltered in the cloistered cell,
Where his holy burthen well
Almost forty years he bore;
Noyon's prior, twenty-four,
For the common weal he strove,
Bound the monks with cords of love;
While his life, with profit fraught,
Traced the lessons which he taught.
Most, it was his special care
To complete this house of prayer,
And the stately fabric raise
In Mary's name, to God's high praise.
May He all his sins release,
Grant him endless life and peace!

Having said thus much of some of my friends and co-temporary acquaintances, I return to the course of the annals from which I have a little disgressed.

[1] If Roger was the fourth prior of Noyon, as the epitaph represents him to have been, our author has omitted to notice his two predecessors. But in the text of the history he calls him the successor of Robert de Prunelai; in that case, as we are told, he administered the priory twenty-two years, he must have died about the year 1137. Concerning Robert de Prunelai, who was described as the *Foudre d'Eloquence*, by his cotemporaries, see *l'Histoire Littéraire de France*, ix. 89.

CH. XXXIV. *Philip I., king of France, dies—His son Lewis-le-Gros succeeds him—State of affairs in France.*

IN the year of our Lord 1108, Philip, king of France, took to his bed, and, after a long illness, being sensible of the approach of death, he made a faithful confession, and assembling his nobles and particular friends, thus addressed them; "I am aware that the tombs of the French kings are at St. Denys, but I feel that I am too great a sinner to presume on being interred near the relics of that holy martyr. So heinous are my crimes that I am under the deepest alarm lest I should be delivered over to the devil, and be dealt with as we are told in history was the fate of Charles Martel.[1] I love St. Benedict, and, humbly imploring that beneficent father of monks, I desire to be buried in his church on the Loire. He is a kind and merciful saint, and propitious to all sinners who resolve to amend their lives and seek the favour of God according to the discipline of his rule." King Philip, having finished this sensible discourse, and added more to the same purpose, died on the fourth of the calends of August [July 29th], in the forty-seventh year of his reign, and was buried in the abbey of St. Benedict, at Fleuri, according to his request, between the choir and the altar.[2]

The following Sunday[3] Lewis Theobald, his son, was crowned at Orleans, and swayed the sceptre of France in prosperity and adversity twenty-eight years.[4] He married Adelaide, daughter of Humbert, prince of Dauphiny,[5] who bore him four sons, Philip, Lewis Florus, Henry, and Hugh. He experienced a variety of accidents, as happens in human

[1] On this tradition of the torments inflicted on Charles Martel "in the lowest depths of hell (*inferno inferiore*) for having abstracted the property of the saints, and distributed it among strangers," see the preface to the Life of St. Eucher, bishop of Orleans, in the *Act. SS. ord. S. Benedicti*, sæc. iii. part i. p. 395.

[2] Philip I. died at the castle of Melun on Wednesday the 29th of July, 1108, and was buried in the church of Fleuri-sur-Loire.

[3] The following Sunday, the 2nd of August.

[4] This calculation is not exact. Louis-le-Gros died the 1st of August, 1137, and consequently reigned twenty-nine years. *Le Prevost.*

[5] *Intermontium.* Adelaide was daughter of Humbert, second of that name, called Le Renforcé, marquis of Susa, and count of Maurienne. Lewis had by her eight children, seven sons and one daughter.

affairs, and in his military enterprises was often the sport of a fortune, unstable as the rolling wheel. The nobles of France were frequently in arms against him, and harassed the king and his adherents with a succession of injuries and outrages. Even during the life of his father, who was inert both in war and the administration of justice, they were arrogantly rebellious against both princes, setting at nought the commands of father and son alike.

The royal authority had been much weakened in the hands of King Philip, worn out, as he was, by age and infirmities, and the severity of the laws against oppressors had fallen into abeyance. Lewis was therefore compelled, among his first cares, to call on the bishops through the whole of the kingdom for aid in crushing the tyranny of freebooters and rebels. At that time the communes in France were organized by the bishops, so that the priests accompanied the king to a battle or a siege with standards and the whole force of their parishioners.[1]

Ch. XXXV. *Lewis of France claims the county of Rochefort —His invasion repulsed with loss.*

Lewis had espoused in his youth the daughter of Guy the Red, count of Rochefort, and aimed at reducing to subjection that county, asserting claims to the inheritance. He, therefore, laid siege to Chevreuse, Montlhéri, Bretencourt, and other fortified towns, but the resistance of many of the nobles was so determined that he failed of success, especially

[1] Thus, at the siege of Bréval, in 1094, Ordericus informs us that "the priests with their parishioners brought their banners, and the abbots, assembling their vassals, joined the besieging army." See before, p. 24.

M. Le Prevost only remarks that "these levies *en masse* were inconvenient and of very little use." We are disposed, however, to attach some importance to these passages, as incidentally illustrating a well-known feature in the political system of the middle ages. Our point of view does not so much regard the bellicose spirit attributed to the clergy of those days, nor the weak and defenceless character of the Norman population as contrasted with that which the newly invigorated Anglo-Scandinavian people of England frequently displayed. We rather find evidence in our author's short notices that the bishops and clergy used, their natural influence among their flocks on the one hand in the organization of the commons, for municipal purposes, we believe, as well as military; and on the other, threw their whole weight into the scale of the supreme authority, against their common oppressors, the feudal barons.

as he had given in marriage to Guiscard de Beaulieu the young Lucienne, to whom he was betrothed.[1]

Then Matthew, count de Beaumont,[2] and Burchard de Montmorenci[3] ravaged the lands of St. Denys the Martyr, and in spite of the king's prohibition persisted in devastating them with pillage, fire, and slaughter. In consequence, Lewis, to whom his father had entrusted the government of the kingdom, when he heard the complaints addressed to him by Adam, the abbot of St. Denys,[4] with tears in his eyes, besieged Montmorenci,[5] assaulting the three gates of the castle at once with great vigour. The young Simon de Montfort, who had succeeded to the honours and domains of his brother Richard,[6] strengthened the French forces by his courage and activity. The countess Adela also had reinforced the king's troops with a hundred knights completely armed, count Stephen, her husband having gone on the crusade,[7] and her two eldest sons, William and Theobald, being prevented by their tender years from appearing in arms at the head of their vassals. At length the traitors

[1] In fact Lewis-le-Gros espoused in 1104 Lucienne, daughter of Guy the Red, count of Rochefort, and seneschal of France. This marriage was annulled in 1107 by the council of Troyes, on account of consanguinity, before it had been consummated, and Lucienne married Guichard, lord, not as our author says, of Beaulieu, but of Beaujeu. Guy the Red was so indignant that he joined the enemies of Lewis-le-Gros, who besieged his places of Montlhéri, Chevreux, and *Bertholcortis* (probably St. Martin de Bretencourt, in the canton of Dourdan, about two leagues S.S.W. of Rochefort). These events took place before the death of Guy, which happened in 1108. Ordericus would make them precede the dissolution of the marriage, but his view cannot be adopted. Nor can we understand what right of "inheritance" he could assert to the domains of the families of Rochefort and Montlhéri.

[2] Matthew, count of Beaumont sur-Oise, brother-in-law of Hugh de Grantmesnil. He was at the court of Duke Robert in July, 1096, and was one of the subscribers to the charter which made the abbey of Aumale a dependence on St. Lucien de Beauvais.

[3] Bouchard III. de Montmorenci, another brother-in-law of Matthew.

[4] Adam, abbot of St. Denys, Suger's predecessor, 1094—1122.

[5] The castle of Montmorenci was besieged in 1101.

[6] Amauri, third of that name, lord of Montfort, and eldest brother of Amauri the Strong, Richard and Simon, surnamed the Young, died without having been married. See vol. ii. pp. 485, 487, 495.

[7] Our author appears to have forgotten that Stephen of Blois not only joined the crusade, but had been killed in it in the year 1102. See before, p. 305

who favoured the rebels, and aimed at impunity in robbery and murder, took to flight, regardless of military discipline, and, creating a panic among their comrades more by their treacherous retreat than from fear of an attack, forced them to retire amid the jeers of the enemy. Then Rambold Creton,[1] a most valiant knight, who had been the first to mount the walls at the siege of Jerusalem, was, alas! suddenly killed, as well as Richard Centurio of Lewes, another crusader.[2]

The king again assembled the French army the following year, and laid siege to Chambli,[3] in opposition to the count de Beaumont, but, being the victim of similar treachery, he was obliged to retreat with disgrace and the loss of several of his adherents. It was not in his power to take full vengeance for so many crimes, as his father was still living when these events occurred, and his step-mother caused him much mischief by her private intrigues, and iniquitously created him many enemies.

CH. XXXVI. *Lewis-le-Gros engages in hostilities against some of his turbulent nobles—Theobald de Blois—Robert, earl of Flanders, accidently killed.*

ON the death of King Philip, Lewis ascended the throne, and being more firmly established in the government, held the sceptre with a firm hand, and took strong measures.

[1] See before, pp.171, 177.

[2] *Ricardus Centurio de Laquis Jerosolymita.* We have no other account of this person, but suppose he was a native of Lewes in Sussex, where William de Warrenne founded the priory of St. Pancras. His surname points him out to have been a crusader, as well as Rambold Creton.

Suger avoids allowing that Lewis-le-Gros was repulsed. According to him, "Burchard was so humiliated by these and other disasters that he submitted to the king's pleasure, and settled the dispute which was the cause of the hostilities."

[3] Chambli, in the Beauvoisis. A terrible storm caused a panic in the army of the young prince, which dispersed, after setting fire to their tents, while Lewis was still sleeping. In the confusion which ensued, several lords were taken prisoners, among whom we find Hugh de Clermont, Matthew's father-in-law, whose claims to a moiety of the castle of Lusarche, usurped by his son-in-law, was the cause of this unfortunate enterprise; and Guy de Senlis.

The year following, Lewis returned with a force thrice as large, at the approach of which, Matthew lost no time in reconciling himself to the king.

against the factious. First, he laid siege to Puiset and reduced Hugh to submission by the power of his arms. This knight was handsome but ill-conditioned. His castle was the special retreat of freebooters and outlaws, where unheard-of crimes were committed; and their evil deeds were neither restrained by royal threats and indignation nor episcopal censures. One day, while a body of the king's troops were in pursuit of Hugh along a narrow road, and he was endeavouring by a hasty retreat to get into the castle, he happened to meet Ansel de Garlande, commander of the French army, and suddenly killed him with a thrust of his lance.[1] Meanwhile, Theobald, count de Blois, came to the relief of the besieged with a powerful reinforcement, and compelled the king to draw off his troops. Lewis afterwards re-assembling his army, again appeared before Puiset, and by the superiority of his force compelled the rebels to surrender. He was induced by the importunities of his auxiliaries to pardon the besieged; but, although he spared their lives, little as they deserved it, he razed the fortress, to the great joy both of travellers and the country people residing in the neighbourhood.

Lewis also besieged Gournai-sur-Marne, and severely straightened the garrison for want of provisions. Hugh de Creci, son of Guy the Red, held the place, and refused to obey the knight's command to restore it to the heirs of Garlande who laid claim to it.[2]

One day, Count Theobald, at the head of a numerous body of knights, rode to the bank of the rivulet called Torci,[3] and engaged in battle with the royal troops. As they were, however, too strong for their assailants, the count and his companions in arms were forced to retire, and being pursued as far as the entrance of Lagni, many of them were taken prisoners

[1] Our author has confounded the first siege of Puiset, in 1111, with the third, in which Ansel de Garlande, seneschal of France, was killed in 1118.

[2] Hugh de Rochefort or Montlhéri, second son of Guy the Red, lord of Créci en Brie, Gomets, and Châteaufort, and seneschal of France, after his father, and before Ansel de Garlande, was guilty of great atrocities in his war against Louis-le-Gros, and having been compelled to surrender to the king his castle of Gournai-sur-Marne, took the monastic habit in an abbey of the Cistercian order, about 1118.

[3] A stream between Torci and Gouverne, to the west of Lagni and east of Gournai.

in the vineyards and enclosures, where they had concealed themselves. In consequence, the garrison of Gournai were so much terrified that they came to terms and laid down their arms.

Theobald, descended from a race of kings and counts, was distinguished among the French lords for his wealth, influence, and illustrious birth, and had many powerful and fierce vassals, who were cruel oppressors of their countrymen and neighbours. Some of them neither respected God nor man, as was plainly exhibited by their conduct. In consequence, the king having heard frequent reports of their outrages, was much incensed, and took measures for restraining their oppression of the lower orders by his royal authority. The count's partisans, apprehending the king's power, and the restraint he endeavoured to impose on their evil enterprises, sought refuge under the protection of their powerful lord, and, relying on his support, often dared to engage in criminal undertakings against God and the church. This gave rise to frequent quarrels between the king and the count, and as the malignants persisted in their outrages, much blood was shed on both sides.

On one occasion, the king made an irruption against Count Theobald in the district of Meaux, having in his company Robert, earl of Flanders, and many other nobles. Lewis met with a vigorous resistance from the count's troops, who, being superior in numbers, put to flight the royal force. During the rout, the earl fell from his horse in a narrow way, and, being trampled under foot by the cavalry, he was unable to remount, and, having been raised from the ground with great difficulty, for his limbs were severely fractured, he expired a few days afterwards.[1] Kings, and princes and many people deeply lamented his death, and as far as Arabia the fate of the warlike crusader was deplored both by Christians and Gentiles. His corpse was carried by the

[1] We now return to the year 1111. Robert, the second earl of Flanders of that name, surnamed the Jerusalemite, and brother-in-law of Pope Calixtus II. was in fact trampled under horses' feet in an expedition in which he accompanied Lewis-le-Gros against Theobald IV., count of Chartres and Blois, and expired a few days afterwards. Some accounts give the 4th of October, and others the 4th of December, as the date of his death. His corpse was conveyed to St. Vedast's at Arras. Historians disagree as to the circumstances as well as the time of his death.

Flemings with great sorrow to the city of Arras, which, not long before, he had fortified against Henry the emperor, surrounding it with a stately wall of white stones. He was interred in the church of St. Vedast the Bishop, founded by King Theodoric in expiation of his unjust murder of St. Leger, bishop of Autun.[1]

CH. XXXVII. *Baldwin VII., earl of Flanders—Henry I. attempts to arrest the young prince William, pretender to the duchy of Normandy—After many wanderings he takes refuge with Baldwin.*

BALDWIN, the son of Robert, earl of Flanders, succeeded his father, and, as he was still a youth, his mother Clemence was for some years joined with him in the government of his hereditary states. The opening virtues of the young prince gave indications from which his friends formed sanguine anticipations of his future worth, but he faded in an instant, as the choicest flower shrinks under the slightest touch.[2]

King Henry, returning victorious to England, condemned Duke Robert and others who were taken prisoners with him to perpetual imprisonment. He committed William, the young prince,[3] to the guardianship of Elias de Saint-Saens, but afterwards resolved by the advice of his friends to put him under arrest. For this purpose, Robert de Beauchamp, viscount of Arques,[4] by the king's orders, unexpectedly presented himself at the castle of Saint-Saens. The viscount arrived there one Sunday morning, when the people who were assembled in the church were much amazed at his sudden appearance. Elias himself, the young prince's guardian, was absent at the time, but his friends, without a

[1] It is incorrect to represent this abbey as founded by Theodoric, but he richly endowed it, and was buried there.

[2] Baldwin VII. earl of Flanders, surnamed à-la-Hache, died the 17th of June, 1119, from the consequences of a wound which he received at the siege of Arques, aggravated by his intemperance.

[3] See before, p. 382, where we find that Elias was brother-in-law to the young prince. Ordericus calls him *Infantem*, and in the course of the paragraph, *Clitonem*, equivalent phrases in those times. The former is still preserved in the Spanish title of *Infanta*, given to princes of the blood royal. Clito, like the Anglo-Saxon Etheling, was the peculiar designation of the heir apparent or presumptive. See the note in vol. i., p. 147.

[4] Arques is only five leagues distant from St. Saen.

moment's delay, roused the boy, who was asleep in bed, and secreted him from the search made for him, that he might not share his father's imprisonment. Elias, hearing of this, made haste to discover the retreat of his amiable ward, and, having recovered him, conducted him into foreign lands, where he carefully nurtured him during his exile. Meanwhile, the viscount, Robert de Beauchamp,[1] seized the castle of Saint-Saens, belonging to Elias, for the king, who afterwards gave it to William de Warrenne, his cousin, to engage him to strict fidelity in his service, and determined resistance to his enemies. Elias carried the boy with him in all his wanderings, and brought him up as his own son to years of puberty. In the various countries he visited, the young

[1] Though there are several places of the name of Beauchamp in the district of Caux, and some of their former lords are known, we have reason to believe that this viscount of Arques belonged to the illustrious family of Beauchamp of Avranches, whose seat lay between that city and Granville, as in almost all the charters given in the *Monast. Anglic.* in which this Robert de Beauchamp is mentioned, it is either as a donor or witness in connection with William de Morton or Robert de Mowbrai, the great lords in that quarter. In the list of the benefactors to St. Pancras at Lewes, we find *Dionysia, uxor quondam domini Roberti de Beauchamp,* and their son Richard.

We are unable to supply the link between Robert the viscount and Hugh de Beauchamp, who attended the Conqueror and was rewarded with forty-three lordships, mostly in Bedfordshire, the ancestor of the barons Beauchamp-of-Bedford, which line, however, soon failed. Walter de Beauchamp of Elmely, in Worcestershire, of the same family, was the founder of the main line, which in its several branches became so distinguished in English history. He was steward (dispensator) to Henry I., who appointed him sheriff of Worcestershire and Warwickshire; and an especial favourite with his daughter the empress Maud. William de Beauchamp, the fourth in descent from Walter, married Isabel, sister and heiress of William Manduit, earl of Warwick, through whom he inherited the honours and estates of that powerful family. Walter de Beauchamp of Alcester and Powick was his youngest son, and his lineal descendant in the fifth generation having been created Baron Beauchamp-of-Powick, 25 Henry VI. that title became extinct in the second generation, as the honours of the Warwick line had been long before. Richard, the last Baron Beauchamp-of Powick, left three daughters, the eldest of whom, Elizabeth, married Willoughby, lord Brook, in whose house the earldom of Warwick was afterwards restored. Anne, the second daughter, married William Lygon of Maddresfield, in Worcestershire, in favour of whose descendant, of the same name, through Margaret, the heiress of that family, the barony of Beauchamp of Powick was revived by a new erection. (46 George III.) An earldom was afterwards added; so that this ancient Norman name like so many others, still ranks among the peers of England.

prince was introduced to many great princes and noble lords of castles, who were attracted by his polished manners. Both by his importunities and his promises, Elias earnestly conciliated the regards of all he could influence in his ward's favour; and, publishing the piteous tale of his wrongs, inclined the hearts of many to compassionate his misfortunes. Numbers of Normans espoused his cause, and ardently desired to have him for their prince, thus offending the powerful monarch who then ruled them, and exposing themselves to suspicion in various ways. Above all, Robert de Belèsme, mindful of the friendship and intimate relations which subsisted between himself and Duke Robert, and not having forgotten the vast power which, during his government, he exercised over the greatest of the Norman nobles, used his utmost efforts on behalf of the illustrious exile, the duke's son. There was a frequent interchange between them of hasty messengers who communicated secret intelligence from the one to the other. Thus Robert and Elias encouraged each other by mutual exhortations, and toiled unceasingly to advance the cause of their duke's son. They communicated with Lewis, king of France, William, duke of Poitiers, Henry, duke of Burgundy, and Alan, prince of the Bretons, and several other powerful princes; frequently stirring them up by envoys and letters, and using every means to engage them to lend their aid to William Clito.

At last, Fulk, count of Anjou, betrothed his daughter Sibylla to him, granting him the county of Maine, and for a time was a firm supporter of the young prince.[1] But through the prevailing influence of King Henry, who lavished menaces, entreaties, gold and silver, and a thousand other weighty arguments, the marriage was broken off. He

[1] Our author considerably anticipates these events. It was not till after the death of his son-in-law, King Henry's son William, in 1122, that Fulk betrothed his other daughter to William Clito, as the young Norman prince was called. However, Henry, who in the zenith of his power and prosperity never lost sight of Anjou, *suspectam semper habuit potentiam Andevagensium*; put every engine in motion to hinder this alliance, which he effected by all kinds of menace, entreaty, and corruption. He soon afterwards chose Fulk's son for the husband of his daughter and heiress; so indispensable did he consider the re-union of Normandy, Maine, and Anjou, as a check to the power of the French kings.

employed able pleaders, who raised the question of consanguinity, which, according to the Christian law, prevented the union of the young couple.[1] For Richard, son of Gonnor, and duke of Normandy, was father of Robert I., whose son was William the Conqueror, the father of Duke Robert, who was father of William the Clito. On the other side, Robert the archbishop and count, who was brother of Duke Richard, had a son named Richard, count of Evreux, which Richard had a daughter called Agnes, wife of Simon, who bore Bertrade, Fulk's mother, and whose daughter Sibylla was. It was thus that the affinity between William and Sibylla was made out, and the long-expected union of the illustrious youth was frustrated. The young prince was in consequence forced to leave Anjou, and again compelled to seek the aid of strangers with fear and toil. At last, after many wanderings, he took refuge with his cousin Baldwin, earl of Flanders, throwing himself on his good faith, intrepidity, and resources. The count gave him a cordial

[1] Questions of consanguinity, as canonical impediments to marriage, were one of the scandals which caused most vexation in the middle ages, and which the court of Rome fomented with the greatest activity. The memory of Innocent III. cannot be too much honoured for having fixed a reasonable limit in 1245. In the example now before us, there were eleven degrees of consanguinity between the parties betrothed; but Henry, that mirror of continence, who did not scruple to marry a nun, and filled the court of England with his bastards, was ready to invoke the thunders of the church on the enormity of a marriage between cousins in the eleventh degree, when it was contrary to his interests; and the impediment alleged by so rich and powerful a monarch could not fail of having immense weight.

Ivo de Chartres called marriages between kindred of the twelfth degree incestuous, the very language adopted by the pope on this occasion. It must be remarked that the court of Rome was as violent as Henry himself. A few months before his death, Pope Calixtus confirmed the sentence of excommunication, pronounced by his *virtuous* legate, John of Crema, against the betrothed princess. On the 26th of August, 1123, he wrote to the bishops of Chartres, Orleans, and Paris to have it executed in their dioceses, and that the holy mysteries should be suspended wherever a person guilty of so enormous a crime should reside. It was, indeed, a strange abuse of words to call such an union incestuous, and a deplorable use of the thunders of the church to launch them against such imaginary crimes. But William, the young prince, had not at command the irresistible arguments alluded to, and although powerful and zealous friends interposed in his favour, he never possessed the means which were indispensable to success at the court of Rome.

reception, promising to stand by him under all circumstances, and maintained his rights until he was slain in battle, fighting in his cause, as we shall find hereafter.[1]

CH. XXXVIII. *An epidemic disease and bad season in France — Henry's daughter Matilda married to the emperor.*

IN the year of our Lord 1109, the second indiction, the divine vengeance punished the sins of men with a variety of inflictions, and mercifully terrified mankind, according to the usual dealings of Providence, in order to bring sinners to repentance, that so its clemency and pardon might be extended to the penitent. In France, particularly about Orleans and Chartres, numbers were attacked by an inflammatory disease,[2] which debilitated them, and in many cases ended in death. The harvest was rotted by deluges of rain, so that a terrible dearth ensued, and the vintage almost totally perished. The gifts of Ceres and Bacchus thus failing, a severe famine consumed the people in all quarters. This fatal year was the third of the reign of Lewis, son of Philip, king of France, and the ninth of Henry, son of William the Bastard, duke of Normandy and king of England.

The same year, King Henry gave his daughter Matilda in

[1] There was an old grudge between the kings of England and the counts of Flanders, which is worth mentioning.

William the Conqueror granted to Earl Baldwin, his father-in-law, a yearly pension of three hundred silver marks for the succour he had afforded him in his English expedition. In the time of Robert the Frisian, this pension was not regularly paid; but William Rufus was induced to admit the obligation. Robert of Flanders, the crusader, on his return from Jerusalem, haughtily demanded the arrears: it was then that Henry I. replied that if the matter was left to his generosity, he would do what he could in it, but if they made too much noise about it, he would not give a sou. However, the affair was compromised, and by a convention on the 17th of May, 1101, the payment was raised to four hundred marks, and Robert, on his part, engaged to furnish the king of England a force of five hundred men in time of war. The number was even doubled by a fresh convention of the 10th of March, 1103; but it appears that it was not long before the misunderstanding between the two princes was renewed.

[2] St. Anthony's fire, a disease very anciently known, as it is mentioned in Virgil, under the name of *ignis sacer*. It appears to have been endemic if not epidemic in the middle ages.

marriage[1] to Charles, son of Henry, emperor of Germany. Burchard,[2] archbishop of Cambray, received her from her father, and conducted her to her husband. Roger, son of Richard,[3] and several others of the Norman nobility, accompanied the young princess, believing that this union would raise them to posts of eminence in the Roman empire, and that they might be able to carve out for themselves the highest honours by their valour and intrepidity. In this way their ancestors had gained a footing in England through Emma, Duke Robert's daughter, and in Apulia by means of Sichelgarde, daughter of Waimalk, duke of Salerno.[4] The politic emperor, who was well informed on such subjects, penetrated their designs, and took precautions against being subjected to the pretensions of overbearing aliens. In consequence, by the advice of his Germans, he sent them all back to their own country with presents.

Ch. XXXIX. *Deaths of St. Anselm, of William, archbishop of Rouen, and Hugh, abbot of Cluni.*

At that time, several doctors of the church, eminent for their sanctity and wisdom, departed this life, namely, Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, and William, archbishop of Rouen; those venerable superiors of monasteries, Hugh, abbot of Cluni; Gervase of Rennes;[5] and William of Cormeilles,[6] and several others, were also taken from the world; whose blessed spirits are, as we firmly believe, with God. The earth itself appeared to mourn the loss of these distinguished prelates, the fields and vineyards refusing to yield their

[1] It appears that the parties were betrothed in the year our author mentions, but the marriage was not celebrated till the 7th of January, 1114, when the princess Matilda must have been still very young, as the marriage of her parents only took place on St. Martin's day, 1100.

[2] Our author's memory fails here. It was not Burchard who was bishop of Cambray in 1109, but his predecessor Odo or Odouard, a native of Orleans, (July, 1108—June 19, 1113.)

[3] Roger de Bienfaite or de Clare, who was afterwards created earl of Hertford.

[4] Second wife of Robert Guiscard.

[5] Gervase, abbot of St. Mélaigne at Rennes, died in the year 1109. He had been a monk of St. Florence at Saumur, like his predecessor Even, archbishop of Dol, who died the 25th of September, 1081.

[6] William, abbot of Cormeilles (July 27, 1109). Respecting him see the *Histoire Littéraire de France*, t. ix. p. 491.

usual abundance. Even the unbelieving who were not moved by affection to lament the decease of these eminent fathers, were, at least, compelled to groan under the various calamities which the judgment of God inflicted upon them for their impiety.

Anselm governed canonically the church of Canterbury sixteen years, the flower of all the men of worth who flourished in my time. Dom Eadmer, who had been a monk under the holy man and attended him in his travels, wrote his life in a clever and eloquent work. At length the saintly prelate, being called to receive the reward of his labours from the Lord, departed this life on the eleventh of the calends of May [April 21], and was interred at the foot of the crucifix in the church of the holy and undivided Trinity.[1]

Likewise, Hugh, the venerable abbot of Cluni, after celebrating the passion and resurrection of Christ, fell sick on the following Tuesday, and, taking to his bed, prepared himself for his passage out of this life to the Lord, by confession and prayer. Having himself given commands to the brethren of the convent to choose his successor, he ratified their election of a young monk, named Pontius, by the sanction of his own authority. He then caused himself to be carried by the monks into the infirmary, where the aged abbot, on the Thursday, departed to Christ, whose soldier he had been from childhood. It is said that he governed the abbey of Cluni sixty-four years,[2] and admitted more than ten thousand monks into the service of the Lord of Sabaoth. At his death he was buried in the church which he had himself erected from the foundations.

Thus, two pillars of the church were removed together from the earthly Jerusalem, which is still engaged in pilgrimage amongst aliens, and are, as we trust, immoveably planted for their persevering sanctity in the heavenly Zion. Anselm, the illustrious archbishop of Canterbury, died before Easter, and, robed and mitred, entered on Thursday the palace of

[1] St. Anselm died at Canterbury on Wednesday, the 21st of April, 1109, in the 76th year of his age and the sixteenth of his pontificate. We have already explained what is meant by the expression, *ante crucifixum*.

[2] St. Hugh, abbot of Cluni, died eight days after St. Anselm, on Thursday, the 29th of April, in the 85th year of his age, and the sixty-first of his administration as abbot.

the Almighty King; and on the Thursday following, during the solemnities of Easter, Hugh, his attached friend, passed away in like manner. Ralph, bishop of Rochester,[1] was raised to the see of Canterbury, which he held nine years, although he was for some time afflicted with severe illness. Pontius, son of Count Melguel,[2] undertook the government of the abbey of Cluni, which he relinquished some time afterwards for various reasons, as will appear in the sequel. Having performed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he died on his return in the prison of Calixtus at Rome. His sanctity was nobly exhibited by undoubted miracles performed at his tomb.

CH. XL. *Death and epitaph of William Bonne-Ame, archbishop of Rouen, and of Count Elias — A comet and famine.*

IN the year of our Lord 1110, the third indiction, William, archbishop of Rouen, who had worthily governed that metropolitan church for thirty-two years, died on the fifth of the ides [4th] of February. He was buried in the canons' chapter-house, which he had himself built. The following epitaph, cut on the wall on the east side, describes his character:—[3]

> We cherish WILLIAM's memory, while we weep—
> His pious musings and devotion deep—
> A prelate by his clergy fondly loved,
> Within, without, his fostering care they proved.
> Light of the church, the priesthood's honoured chief,
> 'Twas his in every need to give relief:

---

[1] Respecting this prelate, see vol. ii. p. 251.

[2] Melguel, now Mauguio or Mauguion, two leagues and a half from Montpelier. The counts of Melguel were persons of great importance. Abbot Pontius, or Pons, was nephew of Count Raimond de St. Giles, and godson of Pope Paschal II. His character was very different from what our author, who makes him a saint, represents him to have been. See the *Histoire Littéraire de France*, t. xi. p. 20. Ordericus's predilection for him is the more extraordinary, as having visited Cluni, as he afterwards informs us, he had an opportunity of hearing on the spot the most authentic accounts of the scandals, the acts of violence, and the devastations, still recent, which will for ever stain the memory of Pons.

[3] Respecting William Bonne-Ame, archbishop of Rouen (1079—1110), see vol. ii. p. 168.

For them this chapter-house his skill displayed,
For them the cloisters spread their hallowed shade;
Nor less his charity embraced the poor,
He never spurned them from his open door.
Rich gifts supplied the brethren's aliment,
Churches and tithes, farms, houses, land, and rent.
His pure example those he ruled deterred
From sinful action and unseemly word.
Two days before his vernal path the sun
Traced in the Fishes, WILLIAM'S course was run.[1]

In the course of the same year a comet appeared in the zenith from the fourth of the ides of June to the day before the calends of July. [From the 10th to the 30th of June.] Elias, count of Maine, died shortly afterwards.

For three successive years, from the second to the fourth indiction, a severe famine raged in France, by which the population was much diminished.

CH. XLI. *Geoffrey, a Breton, made archbishop of Rouen—His character—Pope Paschal II. a prisoner.*

IN the year of our Lord 1111, the fourth indiction, Geoffrey the Breton, dean of Mans, was summoned to England by King Henry, and appointed archbishop of Rouen. This prelate, who was eminent for eloquence and learning, instructed his clergy and people in the catholic faith, and was a useful governor of the church of God for seventeen years.[2]

The same year,[3] Pope Paschal was made prisoner by the Emperor Charles, who greatly disturbed the church as I have related in another place.

CH. XLII. *Death of Gilbert, bishop of Evreux—who built that cathedral.*

IN the year of our Lord 1112, Gilbert, the venerable bishop of Evreux, having filled the see thirty-four years,[4]

[1] It is hardly necessary to remark that in the usual phraseology of our author's epitaphs the sun was in the constellation *Pisces*, at the time of William Bonne-Ame's death, February 4, 1110.

[2] He had been dean, and was proposed for the bishopric of Mans. See before p. 227. We shall presently find that this bishop's administration was neither so prudent nor prosperous as our author here describes it.

[3] The 12th of February.

[4] From 1070 to the end of August, 1112, is a great deal more than

died in a good old age on the fourth of the calends of September [August 29th]. He was interred in the church of St. Mary, Mother of God, which he had himself erected, and enriched with funds and ornaments, augmenting the number of its clergy, and consecrating it to divine offices during the night as well as the day. He was succeeded the year following by Ouen of Bayeux, a chaplain of the king's, who was well versed in sound learning, and taught those who were committed to his charge the way of God, according to the rules of the church.[1]

Ch. XLIII. *Visit of Henry I. to the abbey of St. Evroult—Grants a charter to the monks.*

In the year of our Lord 1113, the sixth indiction, King Henry paid a visit to St. Evroult, attended by a numerous retinue of his nobles, and joyously celebrated the feast of the Purification of St. Mary, mother of God. He remained seated a long time in the monks' cloister, examined closely their way of life; and, having learned their rules of discipline, gave them commendation.[2] The next day he was brought into the chapter-house, and, humbly soliciting to be admitted a member of the society, obtained his request. There were with him his nephews Theobald and Stephen,[3] with Conan of Brittany,[4] William, bishop of Exeter,[5] and several other counts

thirty-four years. That part of the nave of the fine cathedral of Evreux, which has been lately restored with great care, toward the choir, was probably built by Bishop Gilbert.

[1] Ouen was a native of Condé-sur-Noireau, and brother of Thurstan archbishop of York.

[2] We may suppose some personal communication to have taken place on this occasion between Henry Beauclerc, who affected to patronise men of letters and the learned monk, our author; and the king probably knew that he was engaged in writing the annals of his reign. Henry was too politic a monarch not to avail himself of the advantage of his position, and we may perhaps in part trace to this condescension the favourable view Ordericus takes of the English king's character.

[3] Theobald and Stephen de Blois—the latter afterwards king of England—sons of the countess Adela, Henry's sister.

[4] Conan II., surnamed the Fat, in the course of the same year succeeded his father Alan Fergan, who retired to the abbey of Redon on account of his infirmities. See a curious charter on this subject in the *Recueil des Historiens de France*, t. xii., p. 506. Alan died the 13th of October, 1119.

[5] William Warlewast, bishop of Exeter. See what is remarked before, p. 203.

and nobles, with their barons. Then, having advised with Robert, earl of Mellent, the king ordered a charter to be drawn, in which all the domains possessed at that time by the abbey of St. Evroult should be briefly enumerated. This was done accordingly, and afterwards Arnold the prior, and Gilbert des Essarts[1] carried the charter to the king at Rouen. Henry then willingly executed it by making a cross, and delivered it to the nobles who were present to be similarly ratified by their each affixing to it the sign of the cross. Those who subscribed were Robert, earl of Mellent; Richard, earl of Chester; Nigel d'Aubigni, Goël d'Ivri, William Peverell,[2] Roger de Thibouville,[3] William de-la-Lund,[4] Robert, the king's son,[5] and many more. This charter was, by the advice of learned men, mainly intended for a protection against greedy heirs, who were yearly plundering the convent of the charitable foundations of their ancestors, and constantly exposed the monks to litigation, to the great injury of ecclesiastical affairs. For this reason the king ratified the aforesaid instrument with his seal, and forbade all men, by his royal authority, from impleading the monks in respect of any of the matters specified in the charter, except in his own court. He then gave sixty salted hogs and ten bushels of wheat[6]

[1] A village near St. Evroult, which furnished several monks and one abbot to that house.

[2] There existed at this time two persons of the name of William Peverel. They were at least half-brothers, the eldest being the son of William the Conqueror. He had the custody of the castle of Nottingham, and his brother that of Dover. It is probably the latter who is introduced here.

[3] Roger de Thibouville, son of Robert, and father of William.

[4] Probably lord of La Londe-sous-Farceaux, son of *Rodulfus de la Landa*, mentioned in vol. ii. p. 187.

[5] Robert, although the king's son, is named after all the rest, because he was illegitimate. He was afterwards earl of Gloucester, and married the daughter and heiress of Robert Fitz-Hamon; and became one of the most eminent men of the succeeding times.

[6] LX. *Bacones.* The trifling quantity of the royal dole of wheat to digest the pork leads to the remark that this grain was not very plentiful, nor much in use for ordinary purposes, in the age of Ordericus. The charter here mentioned has not been published, but it is to be found in the chartulary of St. Evroult in the Imperial Library of France, t. i. vol. iv. 5. The gifts referred to in this note was not comprised in it, and appear to have been the subject of a separate order. It was not as bishop, but probably as viscount of Argentan, that John was commissioned to provide them.

to the monks of St. Evroult, ordering John, the bishop of Lisieux to deliver the wheat to them at Argentan; which he did willingly and without delay. The king, having spent the feast of the Purification at St. Evroult, as I have before stated, proceeded to visit the borders of his states, and fortify the vulnerable points against enemies and freebooters.

CH. XLIV. *Hostilities between Fulk of Anjou and Henry —Also between Theobald of Blois and Lewis—Robert de Belèsme arrested and committed to perpetual imprisonment.*

IN these times, while the children of light enjoyed peace and tranquillity, and the sons of darkness were instigated by restless iniquity, a violent quarrel broke out in France, which caused the effusion of much blood. Fulk the younger, count of Anjou, and son-in-law and heir of Elias, count of Maine, was induced by his uncle Amauri,[1] to threaten damage to King Henry's territories, earnestly imploring King Lewis to afford him succour.[2] Henry, however, posessing both prudence and wealth, and being powerfully supported by a regular army, frustrated the designs of his enemies, as cobwebs are swept away, and felicitated himself on having crushed them without loss on his own side. He caused two forts to be erected to oppose Gervase de Châteauneuf[3], who endeavoured to offer an obstinate resistance, one called Normancourt, the other Illiers,[4] taking from him a third which has the name of Sorel.[5] Many nobles of Maine joined Henry, and, having done fealty, put their castles into his hands. The same year, Theobald, count de Blois, stoutly opposed King Lewis, and by his enterprises caused him signal losses. He even, when the king was besieging the castle of Puiset, compelled him by force of arms to retire.[6] Thus employing his youth, Theobald so occupied the

[1] Amauri de Montfort, brother of Bertrade.

[2] These first hostilities between Fulk and Henry I. are mentioned by no other author than Ordericus. Five years afterwards we shall find that they assumed a more serious character.

[3] Gervase de Châteauneuf, in the Thimerais, son of Hugh. See before, vol. ii. p. 487.

[4] Illiers l'Eveque.

[5] Sorel, near Chartres.

[6] Count Theobald was one of the most bitter enemies of Lewis-le-Gros. Affairs did not turn out so well for him as our author would have us

king of France, that he could not molest his uncle the king of England by invading Normandy.

Then Robert de Belèsme exhibited the great malice which he had long nourished against the king, and having hitherto fawned on him with concealed venom, now broke into open rebellion. He was a crafty and powerful lord, full of avarice and cruelty, and an implacable oppressor of the church of God, and the poor; so that, if I may so speak, Christian history does not exhibit his equal in wickedness. This person openly incurred the guilt of perjury by breaking his oath of fealty, and deserting Henry, his natural lord, at a time when he was exposed to the attacks of numerous enemies, and aiding Fulk of Anjou and the other open adversaries of his suzerain with his counsels and forces.[1] In consequence, lawful charges were preferred against him by the king at Bonneville on the day before the nones [the 4th] of November[2], of having acted illegally against his lord, for that being thrice summoned to his court he had given no appearance, for not having made any return, as the king's viscount and officer, of the royal revenues from Argentan, Exmes and Falaise, as well as other offences. Not being able to clear himself of the countless and enormous iniquities of which he was guilty, both against God and the king, he was, by the just judgment of the royal court, thrown into the strictest confinement.[3] The tyrant, who had oppressed the country and was now preparing to add to his former crimes fresh enormities by rapine and fire in all quarters, being thus in captivity, the people of God rejoiced at being relieved from the robber's

believe. Defeated at Mellun and Lagni, and wounded at the castle of Puiset, he was compelled to implore leave to retire to Chartres.

[1] This must have been before Henry's reconciliation with the count of Anjou.

[2] The French historians give the date of November 4, 1112, for Robert de Belèsme's journey to Bonneville-sur-Touque and arrest. He appears to have ventured there in the character of ambassador from Lewis-le-Gros, which Henry did not respect in the person of his own vassal.

[3] Robert de Belèsme was taken to Cherbourg, and from thence to the castle of Warham, in Norfolk, when he ended his days in strict confinement. Henry of Huntingdon, whose character of this able but profligate nobleman, we have before quoted, speaking of the termination of his career, says: "Of him whose fame had been spread every where, no one knew, after he was in prison, whether he was alive or dead, and report was silent of the day of his death." Letter to Walter, *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.* p. 310.

yoke, and offering thanksgivings to God their deliverer, wished Henry a long and happy life. The king then laid siege to Alençon, which surrendered in a few days, and he gave Godfrey, Adam Sor,[1] and other knights who had the custody of the citadel, free leave to depart, setting at liberty also Hugh de Mes-David[2] and two other knights, who were arrested at the same time as Robert.

CH. XLV. *Peace restored—Henry's interview with the count of Anjou—And with Lewis, king of France—Suppresses an insurrection and takes Villerai.*

THE French and Normans and their neighbours made a truce for some time, and soon afterwards having interchanged friendly messages, mutually agreed on a lasting peace. In consequence Fulk of Anjou went into the country of Alençon the first week in Lent, and had an interview with King Henry at Pierre-Percée,[4] and swearing fealty to him and doing homage, received the country of Maine from the king, to whose son, William the Etheling, he betrothed his daughter. At the same time, Henry restored the county of Evreux to Count William, who had been an exile for fourteen months in Anjou. He also graciously pardoned Amauri de Monfort and William Crespin[5] their offences against him. The exiles who had been expelled by the impious Robert de Belèsme, were recalled and mercifully reinstated in their paternal lands. Peace and joy were restored to the

[1] It should be Adam le Sor, that is, Adam with the red hair. We find (vol. ii. p. 196,) William le Sor granting the church of Radon to St. Evroult, It was, therefore, an hereditary name which this family appears to have left to Mont-Sor, a suburb of Alençon, on the left bank of the Sarthe. Perhaps they were descendants of the *Soreng*, of whom William de Jumièges has traced a revolting picture. *Historia Normannorum*, l. vi. c. xiii. and xiv.

[2] Médavi, in the canton of Mortrée, two leagues and a half from Alençon.

[3] The first week in Lent in the year 1113 commenced on the 23rd of February.

[4] *Petram-Peculatam.* The historian of Alençon fixes the site at Hertré, near that city, for the sole reason that vast quarries of granite are found there. There is a place called Pierre-Pouquelée, but it is at some distance, near Ferté-Fresnel, at which there stood a dolmen, which is now destroyed. Probably the interview took place near some other druidical monument in the neighbourhood of Alençon. M. Dubois finds it at Pont-Perée, one league from that place on the road to Brittany.

[5] William Crespin, castellan of Dangu.

churches of God at St. Evroult, Séez, and Troarn, which had long groaned under the grievous oppression of a cruel lord, and their seizin of the churches, tithes and other possessions of which they had been unjustly deprived, were renewed. Among the rest St. Evroult recovered the thirty pence of money of Maine,[1] which earl Roger, with the consent of his son Robert, had given to St. Evroult for lights in the church, payable yearly out of the rents of Alençon at the beginning of Lent, together with all the other possessions which the same earl had granted by his charter, but his iniquitous heir had unjustly invaded.

At length, King Lewis, having proved in various ways the magnanimity as well as the great ability and valour of King Henry, abandoning the counsels of traitors who preferred revolt to peace, resolved to have a conference with him, and make a durable treaty to the advantage of holy church. The two kings therefore met at Gisors, in the sixth indiction, and the last week in March,[2] and peace having been sworn to on both sides, embraced each other in the bonds of friendship to the general joy. Then Lewis granted to Henry the lordship of Belèsme and county of Maine, and the whole of Brittany, Fergan the prince of the Britons, having already done homage to the king of England as his vassal; and the king had betrothed one of his daughters to Conan, Fergan's son.[3]

Meanwhile, Aimeric de Villerai[4] and other lords of Belèsme, to whom William Talvac, Robert's son, had committed the custody of the castle while he was absent in defence of his county of Ponthieu, trusting in the great strength of the fortress, and the number of their retainers, prepared to resist with vigour any one who should venture to assault it. Upon

[1] According to M. Leopold Delisle, each of these sous of Manceaux was worth about 3 franks 40 cents of present value in French money, so that the thirty sous are equivalent to 102 franks.

[2] This meeting took place in the last week of March, 1114, in the field, still remaining, of Ormeteau-Ferré, on the territory of Gisors, on the further side of the Epte.

[3] We suppose Conan III., duke of Brittany, Alan Fergan's father, had already abdicated the government of the duchy to retire to the abbey of Redon, where he ended his days. Fergan's marriage with Matilda, a natural daughter of Henry I., did not turn out well, as the Breton was compelled to repudiate the sole male issue of the union.

[4] He must have been the son of Aimeric de Villerai, whose tragic end is related, vol. ii. p. 110.

this, King Henry, assembling the whole military force of Normandy, laid siege to Belèsme, on the calends [the 1st] of May, and was more successful than he hoped. For Theobald count de Blois, Fulk of Anjou, Rotrou of Mortain,[1] and other distinguished nobles marched to the aid of the Normans, and investing the place with their troops, entered it victoriously three days afterwards. It happened to be the feast of the Invocation of the Holy Cross, and the king had issued orders to the whole of his army to suspend the attack and not to engage in any military enterprise. However, the troops of count Theobald and Rotrou, not having heard of the kings's command, appeared in arms; upon which some knights of the garrison issued forth from the castle to engage in single combat The besiegers charging them impetuously, they wheeled their horses round and made a hasty retreat to the western gate; but at its entrance they were overtaken and beaten down by their pursuers, and the doors were prevented from being closed by the number of lances, so that they remained wide open. The royal army forthwith marched in with loud shouts, and made themselves masters of the greater part of the place. Then, as those who guarded the citadel made a vigorous resistance, they set it on fire, and this noble edifice, which Robert had for a long period enriched and fortified, was burnt to the ground.

Henry, thus victorious, having established peace with all his neighbours, returned to England, and during five years,[2] governed his kingdom over the sea, as well as his duchy on this side the channel, in great tranquillity; his faithful adherents offering devout thanksgivings to the Lord God of Sabaoth, who disposes all wants with power and mercy. Amen.

[1] Rotrou, second of that name, count of Perche.

[2] Our author is not more exact than usual in his chronological calculations. The king, indeed, passed part of this year in England, but he again visited Normandy before Michaelmas, and did not return till the month of July, 1115. He was again in Normandy in the month of August, 1116, and the archbishop of Canterbury found him at Rouen in September. It appears certain from Florence of Worcester and Brompton that he returned there by Easter, 1117, and that the king of France and the earl of Flanders having made an expedition into Normandy in the course of that year, only ventured to pass one night there from apprehension of being surprised by Henry. The profound tranquillity which Ordericus makes him enjoy in the bosom of his kingdom for five years, must be reduced to a few months.

BOOK XII.

CH. I. *Pope Gelasius II.—War between Henry and Lewis in Normandy—A legend of Brittany—Death of Queen Matilda and the earl of Mellent—And of the count of Evreux—The succession to that county.*

IN the year of our Lord, 1118, the eleventh indiction[1], on Christmas eve, a violent tempest overthrew many buildings and trees in the western parts.

On the death of Pope Paschal, John of Gaieta, formerly chancellor and master of requests in the Roman Church, was elected pope, and contrary to the emperor's wishes, was canonically consecrated by the clergy of Rome.[2] At the same time Bourdin, archbishop of Prague, who received from his adherents the name of Gregory VIII, was by the emperor's intrigues intruded into the church of God.[3] In consequence, a grievous schism was made, and a cruel persecution ensued to the great injury of the catholics.

At that time there was a serious misunderstanding between Lewis, king of France, and Henry, king of England, and the hostilities of those powerful monarchs frequently devastated their respective territories. King Lewis rendered aid to the exiled William for the recovery of his inheritance, and a great number of the Normans espoused his cause with all their might. Meanwhile, Henry surprised the castle of St. Clair,[4] and holding possession of it for a long time against Osmond[5] and other freebooters in that neighbourhood, he inflicted from thence great losses on the French. On his part, King Lewis surreptitiously entered Ford-Nicaise,[6]

[1] We believe that it should be 1117, the tenth indiction.

[2] John of Gaiéta, a monk of Monte-Cassino, elected pope the 15th of January, 1118, by the name of Gelasius II.; ordained priest the 9th of March, and consecrated at Gaieta the next day.

[3] Maurice Bourdin, archbishop of Prague, was elected pope at Rome the 9th of March following

[4] Saint Clair-sur-Epti.

[5] Osmond de Chaumont, first of that name, surnamed the Elder. He is mentioned before, vol. i. p. 472. It appears that he was lord of St. Clair, and married the heiress of Quitri.

[6] See note, vol. i. p. 131. The modern name of this place is Gane. In the ninth century it was a priory dependent on the abbey of St. Ouen at Rouen, whose relics were deposited in it in 872.

commonly called Vani, in the disguise of a monk, he and his knights being muffled in black cowls; and, fortifying the cell of the monks of St. Ouen which stands there, shamefully made the house of God, set apart for divine offices, a den of thieves. The king of England hearing of this, flew to the spot with his troops, and built two forts, to which the enemy in derision gave foul names, calling one of them Malassis, and the other Gête-à-Lièvres.[1] This war, furiously raging for nearly four years, devastated the states of both princes with fire, rapine, and cruel slaughter.

Pope Gelasius was a prelate of great erudition, and having been chancellor of the holy see nearly forty years, had great experience in affairs and was an able politician. But his government of the Roman church did not last quite two years. His avarice was so excessive, that, paying a visit to France, he oppressed the churches in those parts to supply the inordinate expenditure of the Roman court, but he passed away like the morning dew at the breath of God.

At that time, in Brittany, the devil appeared to a woman who was confined by childbirth, in the shape of her husband, and on her asking for food he gave it her. The woman, deby the guise he assumed, ate of it, and having finished the meal, the devil vanished. Shortly afterwards her husband came in, and hearing what had happened, was greatly terrified, and told it to the priest. The priest having invoked God's name, touched the woman, sprinkled her with holy water, and instructed her what to say if the deceiver should appear again. On Satan's return, she put the questions to him with which she had been furnished. "What," she said, "did the violent wind which roared so terribly before Christmas, and caused us great alarm, portend? Houses and churches were unroofed, the pinnacles of towers blown down, and numberless oaks levelled in the woods." The devil replied, "God had resolved that great part of mankind should perish, but the efficacious prayers of the saints procured pardon for the race of man, and the storm fell on

[1] *Trulla Leporis;* its site is not known. The ruins of Malassis form an enclosure on a farm to the south of Gani, on the road to Vernon. The fosse is about a yard deep.

[2] Pope Gelasius died at Cluni the 29th of January, 1119, so that he was pope only one year and fourteen days.

the trees. Notwithstanding, within three years, there will be grievous tribulation in the world, and several persons of exalted rank will perish." At these words the woman sprinkled holy water, and the devil vanished.

About the same time a prodigy was seen in England. A rustic having bought a pregnant cow at Ely, he killed and opened it by order of Hervey the Breton, bishop of that diocese.[1] Strange to say, instead of a calf, three little pigs were found in it. A certain pilgrim from Jerusalem,[2] who chanced to meet the countryman driving the cow home from market, told him, and afterwards repeated to the bishop and other by-standers, that three great persons in the dominions of King Henry would die that year, and many severe calamities would follow. The pilgrim's prophecy was justified by events which occurred in the time specified.[3]

In fact, William count of Evreux died on the fourteenth of the calends of May, [18th April], and was interred at Fontenelles, in the abbey of St. Wandrille, by the side of his father Richard.[4] Soon afterwards, Queen Matilda, whose baptismal name was Edith, died on the calends [the 1st] of May, and lies buried in the church of St. Peter, at Westminster,[5] likewise, Robert, earl of Mellent, expired on the

[1] Hervey, the Breton, at first bishop of Bangor, and translated to Ely in 1109, died the 30th of August. Respecting his attempt to obtain the see of Lisieux, see before, p. 416.

[2] *Quidam Ierosolymitanus*, a surname often adopted or attributed to those who had taken part in the crusades, and not meaning, as it would sound, a native of Jerusalem. Our author applies it here to a simple pilgrim, returned from the Holy Land. But in general they were designated as palmers, on account of the palm branch which they were in the habit of carrying.

[3] Without attaching to this episode more importance than it deserves, we may be allowed to remark that the paragraph, as well as the opening of the present book, has reference to somewhere about the period of Christmas, 1117; but our author, reckoning the beginning of the year from that feast, has naturally placed these occurrences in 1118.

[4] The counts of Evreux were neighbours of St. Wandrille in their domain of Trait. Richard, William's father, had died the 13th of December, 1067.

[5] Queen Matilda, whose monastic ideas did not accord with her husband's irregular life, retired to the monastery of Westminster after having given birth to two children. *In posterum et parere et partire destitit*, says a cotemporary historian. She wore haircloth even under the royal mantle, and during Lent trod the pavement of the churches with naked feet.

nones [the 5th] of June, and reposes with his father and brother in the chapter of the monks, at Préaux.[1] After the death of these distinguished persons, there were great troubles in Normandy.

Amauri de Montfort, son of Simon and Agnes, Count William's nephew by his sister, laid claim to the country of Evreux, but the king gave him a prompt denial, by the advice of Ouen, bishop of that city. In consequence, Amauri flew to arms with all his force, and nearly the whole of France espoused his cause against King Henry. He was warlike and powerful, possessing fortified castles with strong garrisons; and his kindred abounding in wealth and resources, he held a high rank among the French nobility.

The same year, in the month of October, William Pointel[1] put him in possession of the citadel of Evreux, so that

Having quitted the gay and busy court of England, she resumed her habits of gathering about her the sick, suffering under the most disgusting disorders, whom she nursed, and clerks skilled in church music, whom she encouraged by a lavish use of her revenues. It was not at Westminster, as our author says, but at Winchester, that her remains were interred, *in vetere cœnobio*. Afterwards, King Henry transferred them, with the bones of Queen Frytheswyde, to *The Holy Hole*. Ordericus makes an important remark on Queen Matilda's name, which is probably applicable to other persons of the middle ages. It is, that the name she bore in the world was not that of her baptism.

[1] Robert, earl of Mellent (comte de Meulan in Normandy), terminated very unhappily a long career surrounded by all the *éclat*, power, and wealth that great talents and unbounded ambition and avarice could command. His wife betrayed and deserted him, the powerful faculties of his mind became clouded, and in his last moments the clergy who attended him, even the archbishop of Rouen himself, who hastened to his deathbed, failed of obtaining from him any restitution to those he had wronged, or any sign of repentance. See his character noticed before, p. 358, and in that interesting tract by Henry of Huntingdon, in which he gives an account of the most eminent persons of the age in the shape of a *Letter to Walter* (*Bohn's Antiq. Lib.* p. 309), where fuller details are given of his last moments than those supplied by Ordericus.

[2] *Punctellus;* there is a commune of this name in the canton of Briouse, and we are furnished with the names of two persons, one called *Mansellus de Punctello*, the other *Willelmus* de Pointel, who are mentioned in a charter of William de Briouse in favour of St. Florence at Saumur. Here, however, Punctellus is evidently a surname. A *Tedricus Pointel* appears in Domesday-book as tenant *in capite*. William Pointel is twice named as one of the justiciaries of Amauri, count d'Evreux, in a judicial proceeding at Gaillon. He is the same person who is mentioned here. We shall find afterwards that he was a nephew of Ralph de Vitot (near

the whole place was exposed to pillage. All the bishopric was also ravaged, and bishop Ouen, with his clergy and attendants, compelled to seek safety in flight. Then Hugh de Gournai, Stephen, Count d'Aumale, Eustace de Breteuil, Richer de Laigle, Robert du Neubourg,[1] and several others, revolted against King Henry, and used every effort to restore William the exile, Duke Robert's son, to his father's rank and states.

CH. II. *Baldwin VII., earl of Flanders, dies from a wound received in Normandy—His cousin, Charles of Denmark, succeeds him.*

BALDWIN the younger, the intrepid earl of Flanders,[2] took arms against King Henry with his whole force, to re-establish his cousin William in his paternal inheritance. Henry, Count d'Eu,[3] was among the first to aid the rebels by joining their league, but the wary king, discovering this, arrested him at Rouen with Hugh de Gournai, and threw him into prison till he surrendered his fortresses. Upon this Baldwin, at the head of a large body of Flemings, made an eruption into Normandy as far as Arques, and burnt the villages in the Talou in Henry's sight, who, with his Norman followers, witnessed the flames. The king, in his moderation, contented himself with fortifying Bures,[4] and, suspecting the fidelity of most of the Normans, threw into it a garrison of Bretons and English, whom he took into his pay, and provided with abundant supplies. Baldwin's daring courage often led him there to provoke the Bretons to feats of arms. At last he was wounded by one Hugh Boterel,[5]

Neubourg), who must have been grandson of Robert de Vitot, one of the assassins of Gilbert, count de Brionne. See vol. i. p. 450. This family was always devoted to the counts of Evreux.

[1] Robert, lord of Neubourg, third son of Henry, earl of Warwick, and Margaret du Perche.

[2] Baldwin à-la Hache, earl of Flanders, 1111—June 17, 1119.

[3] Henry, count d'Eu, was son of William, count d'Eu, and Hélisende d'Avranches, sister of Hugh, earl of Chester. His wife, Margaret de Sulli, was great niece of Henry I.

[4] Bures en Brai, in the valley of the Béthune, about four leagues from Arques. It formed part of Queen Matilda's dowry.

[5] This family was established in England in the county of Warwick. Several persons of the name of Boterel are mentioned in the *Monasticon Anglicanum*, but none with the Christian name of this Hugh, who does not

and being on excellent terms with Count Stephen and the Countess Havise,[1] he withdrew to Aumale, where, it is reported, the night following he supped on meat which was too young, drank mulled wine, and slept with a woman. These indulgences, when suffering from his wound, brought on a mortal disease, which ended in death, after he had languished in great pain from the month of September to the June following.[2] All who founded hopes on him might thus learn, that we must not trust in man but in the Lord.

On Baldwin's death Charles d'Ancre, his cousin,[3] the issue of one of the daughters of Robert the Frisian, succeeded to his estates, and being occupied with his own affairs, made peace with the king of England and his other neighbours.

Ch. III. *Insurrection in the Talou and Caux, in which Hugh de Gournai takes the lead, and is joined by many of his barons, freebooters in Normandy.*

Hugh, son of Gerard de Gournai,[4] had been brought up by

appear to have been a person of any note. Henry I. gave one moiety of Alcester to William Boterel, who married Alice Corbet, and was a benefactor to that abbey.

[1] This name is spelt *Advise* in the charter of foundation of the abbey of St. Victor, in Caux, where it designates the wife of Roger de Mortemer, grandmother of Avise de Mortemer, daughter of Ralph de Mortemer and countess of Aumale.

[2] His illness lasted till June 17, 1119. He did not expire at Aumale, but at a place called Rosselar, now Roulers, south-west of Bruges, being then twenty-six years old. Others say that he died at St. Bertin itself, after having taken the cowl, and spent the last two months of his life in monastic habits. His body was interred in that abbey. We give in the original another account, which confirms that of our author: *Crebis ictibus galea quassata, cerebrum violatus. Caussam ferunt morbi augmentati quod eâ die allium cum aucâ præsumpserit, nec nocte Venere abstinuerit.*

[3] Charles, son of Canute, king of Denmark, and of Adela of Flanders; consequently cousin-german to Baldwin. The surname given him by our author was derived from a castle granted him by his cousin as long before as 1115. This domain of Ancre is now called Albert, since it belonged to the Constable Albert de Lugnes, after being confiscated in 1617 by the forfeiture of Concini, the famous Marshal d'Ancre.

Charles of Denmark also assumed the title of count d'Amiens after his marriage, about the year 1118, with Margaret, daughter of Reynold, count de Clermont, and Adelaide, or Alice de Vermandois.

[4] Hugh de Gournai, second of that name, son of Gerard de Gournai, and son-in-law of Dreux de Monchi-le-Châtel in the Beauvoisis.

the king as his own son; he had knighted him when he was of age to bear arms, placed him among his highest nobles by restoring to him his father's lordships, which had been for some time administered by his father-in-law, Dreux, and, from the king's misplaced confidence, he took possession as a friend of the fortresses entrusted to his custody. Hugh, however, did not repay the favours of his munificent patron with the gratitude he owed him; for he allied himself with traitors, and presumed to rebel against his lord and foster-father.

In the month of June he consulted with the king respecting his sister Gundrede, and by his advice betrothed her to Nigel d'Aubigni, a powerful nobleman. After the espousals, while the bridegroom and bride were celebrating their marriage, Hugh and his friends suddenly retired, and took arms the same day against the king. Coming unexpectedly to the castle of Plessis, he slew on the spot Bertrand, surnamed Rumex, who had faithfully guarded it for the king and himself,[1] and entrusted its custody to Hugh Talbot, his nephew.[2] However, the king recovered the place soon after-

[1] All this paragraph is very obscure. The situation of the castle of Plessis, of which Bertrand Rumex had the custody, for the king and Hugh at once, cannot be fixed with any certainty, but it was probably at St. Martin-du-Plessis, on the confines of Brai and the Rumois. Nor can the exact signification be given of Bertram's strange surname.

[2] Hugh Talbot was a vassal of the lords of Gournai. The first member of this family who bore the name of Hugh appears to have been *Hugo cognomine Taleboth*, who was probably father of the Hugh of whom we are speaking, and who made a charter in favour of La Trinité-du-Mont. Among the witnesses to it we find a person named Guilbert d'Eu; and there is reason to believe that the family of Talbot derived its origin from that county. Then come Richard and Geoffrey Talbot, appearing as mesne-tenants in Domesday-book. Richard was witness to a grant by Walter Giffard in the time of the Conqueror. The English genealogists make his wife to have been a daughter of Gerard Gournai, and Hugh Talbot to be the offspring of this marriage, being thus nephew of Hugh Gournai, son of Gerard. But this opinion is scarcely borne out by the present passage of Ordericus, and the words *nepoti ejus*, are susceptible of another interpretation. However that may be, the person mentioned by our author is undoubtedly the same as the *Hugo Talebot* who subscribed a charter to the abbey of Savigni in the time of Turgis, bishop of Avranches. He held twenty knights' fees in England in the time of Henry I., and probably married a sister of Geoffrey de Mandeville, earl of Essex, in the time of King Stephen. This family made several grants to the abbey of Beaubec,

wards, and having strongly fortified it, stationed there Robert and William, sons of Amauri, with a gallant band of knights for the protection of the country.

Meanwhile Hugh obstinately persisted in his rebellion, collecting arms and troops in his castles of Gournai, la Ferté, and Gaillefontaine,[1] and laying waste the whole country between the Seine and the sea with fire and pillage. Robert, surnamed Hachet,[2] Gerard de Fécamp,[3] Enguerrand de Vasceuil,[4] Anselm and Gilbert de Cressi,[5] and other greedy freebooters, became his partisans, and waged a cruel war in the Talou and the district of Caux. Making incursions during the long winter nights, they carried off

to which also Hugh, son of Gerant de Gournai was a benefactor, and where he assumed the monastic habit.

The name of TALBOT, before it was adopted by a family, was that of a place on the river which gave its name to the Talou, the *Tale*, or Tele. The termination *bot* or *bod*, signifies a domain. TALBOT may be interpreted "a habitation in the valley," and would then be synonymous with DAUBEUF.

[1] Gournai-la-Ferté, in Brai. Gaillefontaine; a charter during the minority takes for its date the foundation of this place: *Primo anno constructionis castri quod Goislenfontana dicitur . . .*

[2] This name appears to have been originally spelt Haget. Geoffrey Haget is mentioned in the great charter of Beaubec as having given to that abbey possessions in Beaubec itself. The family became established in Yorkshire, where it was long settled, and in Gloucestershire. See the *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Walter Hageth was the first we find in Normandy, who was witness to a charter made to the Trinité-du-Mont.

[3] Gerard de Fécamp undoubtedly belonged to the family of William de Fécamp, the founder of Beaubec, and a great proprietor of lands between that place and la Rosière. The signatures of Robert and Richard de Fécamp appear on the great charter of Beaubec; probably sons of William de Fécamp. They must have been persons of distinction, as their signatures immediately follow that of the suzerain. There is also in Domesday-book a William de Fécamp among the mesne-tenants in Hampshire.

[4] Enguerrand de Vascœuil was still living in 1149, at which time, by order of Geoffrey Plantagenet, he submitted to a judgment in court in favour of the monks of Préaux, who complained of wrongs he had done them.

[5] Anselm and Gilbert de Cressi did not belong to the district of Brai, but to the central part of the Talou. They were vassals of the earls Warrenne. Several persons of this family are mentioned in Norman and English charters; among others Hugh de Cressi, under Henry II., and Roger de Cressi in Normandy. They were also barons by tenure of English domains. But the Norman Roger de Cressi lived long before one of the same name in England. It appears certain that he was cotemporary with William de Warrenne, earl of Surrey, who died in 1135.

both knights and farmers, with their wives and even infants in the cradle, and throwing them into their dungeons exacted enormous ransoms. They had many accomplices in those districts who gave them an asylum, and even concealed them for a long time when it was necessary. Refreshed by this hospitality the robbers sallied forth on their criminal enterprises, and committed great havoc among the farmers. It was thus that the people of Brai ravaged the whole of the Roumois, and threatened it with worse evils, harassing their neighbours by the aid of numbers who joined them from France and Normandy.

There was no one who opposed them except William de Roumare, castellan of Neuf-Marché, and his companions in arms. Those who lived near the rich meadows, on the banks of the Epte, frequently drove to their home-steads the cattle which they had carried off from a great distance.

At that time treason chilled and numbed the hearts of eighteen of the noble castellans of Normandy, whose power and renown surpassed all the rest, so that, favouring the side of the exile William, they rejoiced to find the royal cause weakened.

CH. IV. *Hostilities of Fulk count of Anjou—Henry cedes a frontier district of Normandy to him—Irruption of Lewis of France into the duchy—Henry's expedition to Laigle and recall to Rouen.*

AT that time Fulk, count of Anjou, being called in by Robert Giroie,[1] who was defending the castle of St. Ceneri against the royal forces, marched to his aid at the head of five hundred troops, and laying siege to La Motte-Gautier,[2] which the king had garrisoned, and pressing it with great vigour, assaulted it for eight days with increasing forces, in the end of July. When news of this reached King Henry he hastened to Alençon, and despatching heralds called out the warlike array of the whole of Normandy. Meanwhile the Angevins harassed the Normans by frequent assaults, and shattered the fortifications with the enormous stones they hurled against them. Thus the

[1] Respecting Robert Giroie, see before, pp. 26—28.

[2] At Clinchamp, commune of Chemilli, department of the Orne. The place was razed to the ground the 1st of August following.

garrison, consisting of one hundred and forty knights and men-at-arms, were forced to surrender, on the terms that they should not undergo mutilation, and should keep their arms. Their leaders, Roger de Saint-Jean, and John his brother, were selected by the king. On the calends [the 1st] of August, the Angevins, having razed the fortress to the ground, returned triumphant to their own territory. The garrison retired to Alençon in great distress, and much ashamed of their surrender, at which the king was very indignant. However they excused themselves with great show of reason, alleging that they had frequently sent messengers to demand relief, which, though long expected, did not arrive in time, while they were continually exposed to the violent assaults of the besiegers.

Then Henry granted Séez, Alençon, and all the domains of Robert de Belèsme in that country to Count Theobald[1] and the count, with the king's licence, gave that fief to his brother Stephen in lieu of his portion of his father's inheritance which lay in France. The young Stephen, therefore, took possession of Séez, Alençon, Merle-sur-Sarthe, Almenèches, and La Roche d'Igé, and arming and garrisoning the castles with his own troops, oppressed the inhabitants of the country by his outrages and exactions, and, changing their customary payments and services under the king, made himself odious, and the vassals disloyal.

In those days the sons of iniquity sat in the chair of contagious evil, and were guilty of many crimes throughout the world. Richer de Laigle claimed his father's lands in England,[2] but the king gave him a positive refusal, saying, that his brothers Geoffrey and Engenulf served in his army, and confidently depended on obtaining those domains by hereditary right. The young Richer frequently urging his claim with great insolence, the king who was much

[1] Theobald, count de Blois, surnamed the Great, for what reason we cannot discover. It was certainly not for his loyalty to his sovereign.

The concession of this frontier of Normandy was a humiliating avowal of weakness on the part of so powerful a monarch as Henry I. It appears from it that he did not feel himself in a position to defend it against the invasions of the count of Anjou. By suffering it to be made over to Stephen, he placed almost insurmountable obstacles in the way of his direct heirs.

[2] They lay in the counties of Surrey and Norfolk.

engaged, altogether rejected his suit, adding some words of contempt. In consequence the haughty young lord left the court of Normandy in a rage, and shortly afterwards made an agreement with the king of France, that unless his paternal inheritance was restored to him, he would desert from the king of England. King Lewis promised Richer that if he came over to his side he would constantly maintain sixty soldiers, and Amauri[1] fifty, in the castle of Laigle.

After this assurance, Richer returned to the English court, and again required of the king to restore him his inheritance; but he obtained no redress, and retired sorrowful. The next day, his uncle, Count Rotrou, spoke to the king on the subject, and tendered him good advice to prevent the revolt from spreading. The king accepted his counsels, and gave him a message to Richer that he would grant him what he asked. Being greatly delighted at this, he hastened to meet King Lewis, who was already on the march with a large body of troops. "I, my lord" he said, lately made an agreement with you which I am unable to keep: for the king of England, my own sovereign, has restored to me all that I demanded, and it is but just that I should perfectly maintain my fealty to him." King Lewis replied: "Be gone! I shall effect all that is in my power." Upon this, Richer returned home, and Lewis following in his steps, with his whole force, appeared before the gates of Laigle. As the garrison were determined to resist, the king commenced the assault, and some one, it is not known who, having set fire to the place, it was so fanned by a strong wind that the flames spread, and the whole of it was reduced to ashes. Richer was compelled by this disaster to resort to the king, and having confirmed the former compact, he surrendered the fortress to the French on the third of the nones [the 3rd] of September. The king of France and his troops remained there three days in great want, and, retiring on the fourth, committed the custody of the castle to Count Amauri, William Crispin, and Hugh de Château-Neuf.[2] Then William de Rai, with Sancho,[3] William de Fontenil,

[1] Amauri de Montfort.

[2] Hugh II., lord of Château-Neuf in Thimerais, son of Gervase and son-in-law of the earl of Mellent, who appears to have been already in possession of his father's estates, although the latter did not die till 1140.

[3] *Sancho*; we need not wonder to find a Spanish name in this country,

and Isnard d'Ecublei,[1] observing their fealty to Henry, drew off to Pont Echanfré, and, abandoning all that they held under the disturber of the peace, attached themselves to Ralph-the-Red in opposing the king's enemies.[2] The French, finding that the whole place was burnt to the ground, were not frightened like timid hares; but, bold as lions, established themselves among the ruins of the houses, where they pitched their tents, and ransacked the country for provisions with arms in their hands.

This state of affairs becoming known, King Henry made a forced march to Laigle the next day, and lost no time in laying siege to the place, although it was in ruins, to the terror of all who were in it. But his plans were frustrated by the adverse news brought by William de Tankerville, which the king too easily credited. This person met the king at a village called Livet,[3] and said to him: "My lord, king, where are you going? The Cauchois have commissioned me to entreat you to return with your troops into their country. Hugh de Gournai, and Stephen d'Aumale, with their adherents, have taken possession of the hill above Rouen,[4] and are employed in building a fort in the abbey of the Holy Trinity, expecting your nephew's coming, with a great body of French, to take possession of the place which the citizens are ready to betray to him." As soon as the king heard this he retraced his steps; and the garrison of Laigle pursued his army as it retreated by different roads.

when we recollect that Rotrou II., count of Perche, was nephew of Sancho Ramirez, king of Navarre and Arragon.

[1] He was son of Reynold de St. Martin Ecublei, son of Solomon and Adelaide Giroie, according to an annotator.

[2] These persons met Ralph-the-Red at Pont-Echanfré, now Notre-Dame-du-Hamel, a commune intersected by the Charenton. The church is on the left bank, but the site of the castle on the right. Ralph-the-Red was the devoted servant and confidential agent of Henry I. in this part of Normandy.

[3] This name appears to signify a marshy place, where rushes grow. There are several communes in Normandy so called. M. Le Prevost thinks that the place here mentioned lies between Laigle and St. Evroult, but that there are probabilities in favour of Livet in Ouche; which is M. Dubois's opinion.

[4] Mount St. Catherine. The abbey of La Trinité-du-Mont.

One does not see how this expedition to Rouen from the east could have materially affected the Cauchois, whose territory was not violated.

The French took nearly forty of the people of Moulins,[1] and, having strengthened their position by the booty which they collected from all quarters, restored the fortifications of Laigle, and held it stoutly for a whole year.

King Henry reached Rouen with the utmost despatch, but did not find the enemies he had been led to expect, when his chamberlain, deceiving him, recalled him from Laigle. William de Tankerville thus rendered a great service to the French who, in their exposed situation, were trembling with cold and fear, by drawing off the royal army to another point on a false pretext and to no purpose.

CH. V. *King Henry attacks the castles of La Ferté and Neubourg—Loses all confidence in the Normans—Disturbed state of the duchy.*

THEN the king undertook an expedition with a thousand troops into Brai, and laid siege to Hugh's castle of La Ferté,[2] but violent rains came on which caused great inundations. At length having completely devastated the country, he marched from thence to Neubourg[3] against Robert who had rebelled, and assaulting the place, burnt it to the ground. This Robert was son of Count Henry and Margaret,[4] and was engaged in a lawsuit against his uncle Robert, earl of Mellent, son of Count Robert. However, as the king's authority was employed to protect his cousin, he could not pursue his plea as he wished. He was therefore inveigled by the public enemy to take arms against the king; but although he incurred great losses by his domains being ravaged and given to the flames, he failed of recovering what he claimed. Although he possesses the gift of eloquence, he is slow in action, and is more successful with his tongue than with his lance.[5]

[1] The inhabitants of Moulins-la-Marche.

[2] La Ferté en Brai, which stands on an isolated summit near Forges.

[3] The territory of Neubourg was an extension of the vast domain of Beaumont-le-Roger, which was wrested by the lords of Pontaudemer from the abbey of Bernai, but it originally formed no part of their property. It is, however, certain that Roger de Beaumont possessed it, and that it was dismembered from the rest of his estates as the share of his second son, the good and loyal earl of Warwick, Robert de Neubourg's father.

[4] Margaret, sister of Rotrou, count du Perche.

[5] Our author speaks of Robert de Neubourg as a person still living, and

At this time King Henry was unwilling to engage in any long siege, for in the disruption of all ties which generally attends family quarrels, he put no confidence in those he employed. Even those who ate at his table favoured his nephew and other enemies, and by betraying his secrets rendered them essential service. It was worse than a civil war; brothers, friends, and kinsmen were leagued against each other on different sides, from which they did all they could for each other's injury. Many of the Normans then followed the example of Ahithophel, Shimei, and other rebels, imitating those who, deserting the king anointed by Samuel, joined the parricide Absalom.[1] Such was the conduct of numbers who revolted from the peaceful king chosen and consecrated by the bishops, and, forfeiting the fealty which they owed him as their lord, voluntarily and without any just cause, went over to a beardless count,[2] bent on doing mischief.

Ch. VI. *King Henry holds a council at Rouen, which is attended by the legate of Pope Gelasius II.*

In the eleventh indiction, on the nones [the 7th] of October,[3] a council was held at Rouen, in which the king took order for the peace of his states with Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, and the other barons he had summoned. At this meeting Geoffrey, archbishop of Rouen, represented the condition of the church of God, with four of his suffragans, Richard of Bayeux, John of Lisieux, Turgis of Avranches, and Roger of Coutances, besides many abbots. For there were present Roger abbot of Fécamp, Urso of Jumièges, William of Bec, Odo of Caen, Richard of Préaux, Andrew of Troarn, William of la Croix,[4] and Osberne of Tréport, with many others I need not name.

At this council, the legate of Pope Gelasius, a Roman clerk named Conraci, made an eloquent discourse, having

in point of fact he survived Ordericus, not having died till the 30th of August, 1158, after having enjoyed the entire confidence of Henry II., who conferred upon him the offices of steward and justiciary of Normandy.

[1] See 2 Samuel xv—xix.

[2] William, the Pretender; "Clito," as our author generally calls him.

[3] The 7th of October, 1118.

[4] La Croix-Saint-Leutroi, in the department of the Eure.

from his youth imbibed Latinity from its pure fountain, complaining of the emperor Charles,[1] the irreligious destoyer of the good works and buildings of Pope Paschal, and cruel persecutor of the catholics. He added a protest against the anti-pope Burdin, the intruder into the apostolical see, and described the many tribulations to which the church was exposed in various parts of Italy. He mentioned the exile of Pope Gelasius, who bending before the storm had taken refuge on this side the Alps, and implored the church of Normandy to aid him with its prayers, and still more with its money.

Serlo, bishop of Séez, was not present at this council, but his representative accounted for his absence by alleging his age and infirmities.

Ouen, bishop of Evreux, sent word by his delegate that he could not attend, because he was engaged in the defence of the country against the common enemy. But, "unless the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh in vain:" the same day the citadel of Evreux was given up to Amauri.[2]

Ch. VII. *Evreux seized for Amauri de Montfort—The bishop's residence plundered—He escapes.*

William Pointel, nephew of Ralph de Guitot, who was entrusted by the king with the custody of the castle of Evreux, remembering his former friendship with Amauri at the court of Duke William, and considering that according to his ideas, this distinguished man had been unjustly deprived of the inheritance of his ancestors, introduced by surprise a band of his faithful followers into the citadel, and regardless of the general peace that prevailed deserted the king's service, and espoused the cause of Amauri. He was quickly joined by Elinance d'Auteuil[3] and several others,

[1] Charles Henry, commonly known as Henry V., who married the Princess Matilda of England.

[2] The 7th of October, 1118.

[3] Elinance d'Auteuil, near La Croix-Saint-Leufroi, son of Ansketil d'Auteuil, one of the benefactors of the abbey of St. Saviour at Evreux at the period of its foundation. This commune is on the right bank of the Eure, not far from Evreux.

The name of Elinance is foreign to Normandy, where we find only a single instance of it in the family of Toëni, almost a century before. It has been already remarked that this family was not of Scandinavian origin,

and a wide-spread insurrection disturbed the whole neighbourhood. The party which had seized the citadel took possession of the episcopal residence and the town, plundering the bishop's furniture, library, and ornaments; and reduced the whole of the adjacent district to submission by force of arms.

Bishop Ouen was compelled to flee with his servants for the safety of their lives, and wandered about for twelve months in exile. He left his beard unshaved,[1] and exhibited in the disorder of his dress his grief for the desolation of the church. Such was the tribulation into which Evreux was plunged, that the clergy being driven away the divine office was discontinued during a whole year.

CH. VIII. *Theobald, count of Anjou, obtains possession of Alençon, after a battle under the walls, in which Henry's troops were defeated.*

IN the second week of November, King Henry approached Laigle with a strong body of cavalry and infantry, and ravaged all the country round. Upon this, the garrison of the citadel, who boasted their prowess, sallied forth and were not slack in engaging the royal troops. Count Theobald[2] having been thrown from his horse was taken prisoner, but the King and Count Stephen pursued them with a band of brave knights and nobly snatched the captive count from the hands of his enemies. The engagement then became general, and so sharp that the king himself was struck on the head with a stone; but his brazen helmet warded off the blow without its wounding him.

At this time the burgesses of Alençon revolted against King Henry. I will relate the cause of their giving the king so great offence. Stephen, earl of Morton, their present lord, was a very young man and had not the regard for the burgesses which he ought, nor did he treat them with due

whatever the Continuator of William de Jumièges may have said of it. The introduction of the name into the house of Auteuil may indicate some ancient connection with their powerful neighbours, whose principal stronghold, Acquigni, was not more than three leagues distant from their own residence.

[1] This was a mark of deep mourning in a man of Ouen's profession, which had a great horror of long beards.

[2] Theobald, count de Blois.

respect. Like another Rehoboam he listened to the flatteries of his parasites rather than the counsels of the elders, and imagined that the people of Alençon were disloyal to himself and the king. In consequence he oppressed them with injuries and unusual exactions, little foreseeing what the consequences would be. At last, he summoned a general assembly and required them to deliver to him their sons as hostages for their good behaviour. Obeying this command reluctantly and by compulsion, they waited their time of vengeance full of ill-will. At first, they dissembled their resentment, but it was not long before they took open measures for their redress.

The count received the hostages, but did not give them honourable treatment. He caused the wife of a worthy townsman, who was daughter of Paganus de Cacei,[1] a gallant knight, to be imprisoned in the citadel, where, much to her sorrow, she was in the hands of debauched guards. Her husband Amiot,[2] being much incensed, and feeling the disgrace of this affront, made a secret association with several others who had similar causes of complaint. They imprudently shrunk from appealing to the king who was a lover of justice, from apprehension that he would turn a deaf ear to their charges against his nephew. Under these circumstances they had recourse to Arnulph de Montgomery, Robert de Belèsme's brother, through whom they sent a requisition to Fulk, count of Anjou, to take possession of Alençon, which they were ready to give up to him, upon his securing the free rights of the townsmen and expelling the count's garrison from the citadel. The count of Anjou was well pleased at the proposal, and assembling his knights, archers, and foot soldiers, marched to Alençon, and his forces being admitted into the place in the night, he invested the fortress and vigorously assaulted the garrison. Report, than which there is nothing swifter, spread the news far and wide, and it quickly came to the king's ears while he was deeply anxious about the state of affairs.

As soon as the undaunted king had ascertained the accuracy of the report, he assembled by his royal authority the

[1] Paganus de Chassé, a commune in the arrondissement of Mamers, on the left bank of the Sarthe, opposite Hautrive.

[2] Amiot is a name still very common in all this part of Normandy.

English and Norman levies and many other troops, summoning also to his aid Theobald count of Chartres, with his vassals. At last, in the month of December, they met in great numbers near Alençon for the purpose of affording effectual relief to the besieged. The gallant brothers, Theobald and Stephen, had preceded the king's army, and attempted to throw a convoy of provisions into the place under a guard, but without success. The count of Anjou marched out against them, and disposing his troops in battle array, encountered them boldly. Some were slain, more made prisoners, and the rest being routed, the count returned to the town with much booty.[1] Thenceforth he pressed the siege with more security, and cut off the supply of water by subterranean works, secretly carried on; for the inhabitants were well acquainted with the conduit by which the founders of this citadel introduced the water of the Sarthe into the place. The troops shut up in the fortress finding their provisions fail, and that no relief arrived from any quarter, submitted, and surrendering the citadel, marched out under safe conduct with all their baggage. These disasters gave occasion to much pillage, and the season of our Lord's Advent was little observed. Thus evils grew on all quarters, and Normandy was polluted in every direction by blood, robbery and fire, so that as the scorpions' brood tear open their mothers' entrails by prematurely emerging to life,[2] so the Normans violated the peace of their country before the period of William's legitimate succession to the duchy[3], and miserably wasted it by their cruel enterprises.

While the faithful were celebrating the feast of the

[1] It was an actual and very serious battle, which ended triumphantly for the count of Anjou, but as it afforded little honour to Henry I., the hero for whom our author has so much sympathy, he has done all he can to lessen its importance. It appears to have been fought under the walls of Alençon, at a place still called *Le Champs de Bataille*, between the castle of Alençon and Hertré. See the *Histoire d'Alençon* by Odolant Desnos, t. i. p. 173.

[2] An allusion to the opinion then prevailing, that the scorpion was viviparous, and that the young brood tore their mother's entrails at their birth.

[3] In this passage our author appears to acknowledge the legitimacy of Prince William's claims; an admission which he has suffered to escape from him, contrary to his general tone on this subject.

Apostle Thomas,[1] a violent wind occasioned great damage, portending future disturbances among men and revolutions of states. Soon afterwards the world was afflicted with severe tribulations, many exalted persons falling from the summit of power, while by the Providence of God, who lifteth the poor out of the dust, others were raised to great honours.

CH. IX. *Death of Pope Gelasius II.—He is succeeded by Callistus II.*

IN the year of our Lord, 1118, the twelfth indiction, Pope Gelasius II. died at Cluni, where he was buried, on the fourth of the calends of February [24th January].[2] Guy, archbishop of Vienne, was elected pope on the fourth of the nones [the 1st] of February, by the name of Callistus. There were present on this occasion Lambert, bishop of Ostia, Boso, bishop of Porto, Conon, bishop of Prænestе, with John of Crema,[3] and several other clerks belonging to the Roman senate, who enjoyed the special privilege of electing and consecrating the popes. Guy thus enthroned, had from his youth upwards been continent, devout, charitable, zealous in God's service, and endowed with many virtues. He was son of William Tête-Hardie, duke of Burgundy, whose father was Duke Reynold, and his mother Adeliza, daughter of Richard II., Duke of Normandy.[4] This Guy was the nephew of that cruel Guy, who attempted to seize the duchy of Normandy, and fought at Valesdunes against William the Bastard and Henry, king of France, and stoutly defended Vernon and Brionne against them during three years.[5] Thus, sprung from the blood royal, the brother of

[1] The 21st of December.

[2] See before, p. 446, note 2.

[3] John of Crema was not a bishop: we shall have future occasion to speak of him. Our author has omitted to mention the Cardinal, Peter de Léon, who so powerfully contributed to promote this election, and afterwards, through the influence of his father, Peter II. of Léon, to secure its acceptance by the members of the sacred college residing at Rome.

[4] Callistus II. appears, as it is here stated, to have been the son of William Tête-Hardi, but the latter was not the son, but the grandson of Reynold, count (not duke) of Burgundy, and Adeliza of Normandy.

[5] Guy of Burgundy, son of Reynold I., count of Burgundy, was great uncle of the new pope, and not his uncle. Our author here confirms what he has said in his *eighth* book, of the three years this nobleman made head against the duke, in his castles of Brionne and Vernon, after the battle of Valesdunes fought in 1047.

dukes, and cousin of kings and emperors, as well as eminent for his great virtues, he was advanced to the papacy, which he administered worthily during five years, making many excellent decrees, and doing much for the good of the church of God.[1]

CH. X. *Cruel treatment of hostages—King Henry besieges his own daughter, wife of Eustace de Breteuil, in that place.*

IN the course of the same year, Eustace de Breteuil,[2] Henry's son-in-law, was frequently advised by his countrymen and kinsmen, to break with the king, unless he restored to him the castle of Ivri, which belonged to his predecessors. Henry deferred for a time granting his demand, but promised it at some future period, and, satisfying him by gracious words, retained his allegiance. He was unwilling to quarrel with Eustace, who was one of the most powerful of the Norman nobles, was supported by numerous friends and vassals, and possessed strongly fortified castles; in order, therefore, to secure his fidelity, he delivered to him as an hostage, the son of Ralph-Harenc,[3] who had the custody of the fortress, and in turn took as hostages Eustace's two daughters, who were his own grand-daughters.

Eustace shamefully treated the hostages he received, for at the instigation of Amauri de Montfort, who used every artifice that malice could suggest to renew the quarrel, and made many promises to Eustace on oath which he never performed, he put out the boy's eyes, and in this state sent him back to his father, a most worthy knight. Upon this the father went to the king in a rage, and made known to him the cruel treatment his son had received. Henry, receiving the intelligence with lively grief, delivered up his two granddaughters, that the father might immediately wreak his vengeance on them. Accordingly, Ralph Harenc, with the permission of the incensed monarch, seized

[1] This pope died the 12th or 13th of December, 1124, after governing the church five years, ten months, and twelve days.

[2] Eustace, a natural son of William II., lord of Breteuil. See what is said respecting him before, book xi. p. 344.

[3] There were several families of this name in Normandy. This one was from the district of Evreux, and held the domains of Gauville-la-Campagne We find in 1203, *Radulfus Harenc*, probably a descendant of this person, and father of Roger Harenc, *dominus de Gauvilla*.

Eustace's daughters, and savagely tore out their eyes and cut off the tips of their noses, in retaliation for the cruelty shown to his son.[1] Thus, alas! these innocent children suffered the penalty of their father's ill deeds, and on both sides parental regard had to mourn the injury and mutilation of their offspring. Ralph, consoled by the king, and honoured with presents, returned to the castle of Ivri, and announced to Eustace the revenge which the royal severity had exacted from the persons of his daughters. On learning their calamity, the father and mother were overwhelmed with grief, and the count placed his castles of Lire, Glos, Pont-Saint-Pierre and Paci in a state of defence, that neither the king or his partizans might obtained admittance into them. He sent his wife Juliana, the king's daughter by a concubine, to Breteuil, attended by a sufficient body of troops to guard the place.

The burgesses,[2] who were faithful to the king and unwilling to give him any offence, comprehending that Juliana's arrival would be the ruin of a number of people, sent a message to Henry, begging him to lose no time in coming to Breteuil. That prudent monarch, recollecting what was said by the audacious Curio to Cæsar, relative to military enterprises—

"Delays are dangerous when your plans are laid,"[3]

having listened to the envoys of the burgesses, came in all haste to Breteuil, and the gates being readily opened to him, passed into the place. He returned thanks to the loyal inhabitants for their loyalty to him, and, prohibiting his soldiers from laying hands on their property, laid siege to the citadel in which his contumacious daughter had shut herself up. Juliana was now involved in anxieties, not knowing where to turn, and feeling sure that her father was deeply

[1] We shudder at such atrocities, and wonder that they could be perpetrated with the sanction of a prince who made great pretensions to piety and justice.

[2] It appears that the municipalities in France were rising to some importance, for we hear continually in this part of our author's history of the burgesses of towns in Normandy taking measures for their own security, among the conflicting interests of the king and the various parties of factious nobles in these troublesome times.

[3] Lucan Phars. i. 281.

exasperated against her, and would never retire from the castle he had invested, but as a victor. At length, as Solomon says, "There is no wickedness like that of a woman,"[1] she determined on lifting her hands against the Lord's anointed. In consequence, she treacherously sought a conference with her father, and the king who suspected no such fraudulent design in a woman, giving her the meeting, his unhappy daughter attempted his life. Drawing a crossbow she launched a bolt at him, but through God's protection he escaped unharmed. Thereupon the king ordered the drawbridge of the castle to be broken down, so that no one could either enter or come out.

Juliana now finding herself blockaded on all points and that there was no one to succour her, surrendered the castle to the king; but he would on no account consent to allow her to depart freely: so that the king's orders compelled her to let herself down from the summit of the walls without support, and as there was no bridge she descended into the foss indecently, with naked legs. This took place in the beginning of Lent, the third week of February,[2] when the castle-ditch was full of snow-water which, being half frozen, her tender limbs of course suffered in her fall from the severity of the cold. The unfortunate heroine, getting out of it how she could and covered with shame, joined her husband who was then at Paci, and gave him a faithful account of the sad occurrence. Meanwhile the king assembled the burgesses, commended them for maintaining their allegiance, honoured them with promises and benefits, and by their advice placed the castle of Breteuil in the custody of William, son of Ralph.

Shortly afterwards, King Henry restored to Ralph de Guader,[3] a brave warrior, because he was William de Breteuil's nephew by his sister, all the lordships of his ancestors, except Paci which Eustace held. Ralph kept vigilant

[1] Ecclesiasticus xxv. 26. As we have already had several occasions to observe, the text quoted by our author is not precisely what we find in the Vulgate, which begins with these words: "*Brevis omnis malitia.*" . .

[2] Between the 15th and 22nd of February. Lent began the 4th of the same month.

[3] Ralph de Guader, second of that name, and nephew of William II. de Breteuil.

guard of the castle the king had given him; and, faithful to the king under all circumstances, was distinguished by his eminent services, and valiantly resisted the public enemy in all quarters.

Ch. XI. *Fresh disturbances in the southern districts of Normandy—King Henry quells them in person.*

At the same time the people of Exmes meditated revolt, for those who held Courci,[1] and other strong places in the neighbourhood, hearing that almost all the Normans had deserted from the king and espoused the cause of his nephew, resolved to adopt a similar resolution. In the first instance Reynold de Bailol[2] went to Falaise, and withdrawing his fealty to the king, insolently rejected his demand for the surrender of his mansion house at Renouard.[3] The king then said to him: "As you are come to my court, I will not have you arrested; but you will repent of your evil designs against me." Shortly after his departure, Henry assembled his troops, and appeared before Reynold's castle in the evening, almost as soon as he returned to it himself. The knight, finding that he was not equal to the burden he had taken on himself, came out in the morning, and imploring the royal clemency surrendered his fortress. The king immediately set fire to the mansion which was built of stone, with the stores of provisions, and all that it contained. On hearing this news the garrison of Courci, Grantmesnil, and Mont-Pincon,[4] who had proposed to revolt, remained quiet, and forthwith abandoning their malicious designs from apprehension of suffering like disasters, did not again venture to lift up their horns against their lord the king.

[1] Courci sur Dive, in the arrondissement of Falaise.

[2] Reynold de Bailleul, in Gouffern, near Argentan. We have already seen a person of this name, probably the father of the one here mentioned, among the parties or witnesses to Roger de Montgomery's charter in favour of St. Evroult in 1082. By his mother, Aimerie, Reynold II. de Baillent was great nephew of Earl Roger. It appears that th s lady had contracted a first marriage with Warren-the-Bald, castellan of Shrewsbury.

[3] Renouard, in the canton of Vimoutier.

[4] The two last places are in the arrondissement of Lisieux.

CH. XII. *Lewis, the French king, seizes Andelelys on the Seine—In consequence King Henry fortifies Noyon.*

GEOFFREY, archbishop of Rouen, continually harassed Asceline, son of Andrew,[1] with lawsuits, and much aggravated him by depriving him of his property, unjustly as it was thought by some persons. In consequence, in the bitterness of his resentment he went to the king[2] at Pontoise, and promised to deliver Andelis to him if he would come and take it with an armed force. The French were highly delighted at the proposal, and advised the king to suffer no delay. An agreement having been concluded on both sides, Asceline took with him a select band of soldiers whom he introduced into his barn by night and concealed under the straw; while Lewis followed him closely with a body of troops. The next morning, at sight of the king, the people raised loud shouts, the inhabitants being thrown into a state of great tumult by so unexpected an occurrence. The party who were hidden under the straw now rushed forth, and joining the people in shouting the royal cry of the English,[3] made directly for the citadel. But changing their note as soon as they were admitted, they shouted Mon-joie,[4] the war-cry of the French. Having driven out the natives of the country who were in possession, the French established themselves in the interior of the fortress,[5] and the king's troops took possession of the town by forcing their way through the gates. Richard the king's son and others belonging to the garrison were surprised by this sudden attack, and abandoning all hope of maintaining either the interior or exterior defences, sought for sanctuary in the church of St. Mary the Virgin.[6] In the end, Lewis, being master of the citadel as well as of the whole

[1] This person lived in the Andelis, now Andelys, on the Seine. They were part of the domains of the archbishops of Rouen.

[2] The king of France.

[3] *Regale signum Anglorum.* It does not exactly appear what this was.

[4] *Meum Gaudium;* this ancient war-cry of the French is incorrectly translated by Ordericus, who is the first of the Norman writers who mentions it. According to his derivation, it should be *Ma joie*, but every one knows that the cry really was *Montjoie St. Denis.* The first French author who notices it is William Guiart, in describing the siege of Antioch in 1191, seventy-two years after the affair of Andelis, which occurred in 1119.

[5] A citadel connected with the town is plainly meant; which must not be confounded with the Château Gaillard, or the castle de l'Isle, opposite Little Andelis, erected at a much later period by Richard Cœur-de-Leon.

[6] The church of Notre-Dame in Great-Andelis.

burgh, gave licence to Richard and his comrades to have a free passage to any place they wished, out of reverence for the mother of our Saviour, always a virgin, whose church he devoutly visited, to implore her succour. On the king's departure the French kept vigilant guard in the fortress they had taken in the heart of the country, and subjected the whole neighbouring district on the banks of the Seine to their dominion. Godfrey de Serans,[1] Enguerrand de Trie,[2] Alberic de Bouri,[3] and Baldric de Brai,[4] and other gallant French knights remained there, and although they were excommunicated by the archbishop for usurping the domains of the church, they obstinately held their ground for some time encouraged by the state of affairs and the continuance of the war. Meanwhile, King Henry put the castle of Noyon[5] into a state of defence against the French, and stationed in it a hundred soldiers under command of William, son of Theodoric,[6] general of his army.

CH. XIII. *Richard Fresnel, of La Ferté near St Evroult, takes arms—He is opposed by Ralph of Pont-Echanfré—The king in person quells the revolt—Richard Fresnel dies at the abbey.*

RICHARD FRESNEL,[7] who boasted of no less than eight sons,

[1] Godfrey de Serans-le-Bouteiller.

[2] Enugerrand de Trie, eldest brother of William Aiguillon.

[3] Albéric de Bouri, son of Eustace, founder of the priory of Bouri.

[4] Baudri de Brai-sous-Baudemont.

[5] Now called Charleval. Respecting this domain of the counts of Evreux, recently confiscated by Henry I., see before, p. 419.

[6] We have no information respecting this person. Judging from his father's name, he was neither Norman nor English, and may rather be considered a Fleming.

[7] Richard Fresnel, founder of La Ferté-Fresnel, a near neighbour of the monks of St. Evroult, and a vassal of the lords of Breteuil. The fief of La Ferté-Fresnel was held under them for the service of five knights completely armed. The first person we know of this ancient family is Thorolf, father of Ralph Fresnel, who appears to have been lord-paramount of St. Evroult-de-Montfort and St. Evroult proper, between the years 1030 and 1050. See vol. ii. p. 314. The name Thorolf smacks of its Scandinavian origin.

Ralph Fresnel had two sons, William and Robert (vol. ii. p. 399), who sold to Theodoric, abbot of St. Evroult, the church of Notre-Dame-du-Bois in 1050. The Richard Fresnel mentioned in this chapter must have been the son of one of them.

A Richard Fresnel, lord of Balbec, appears on a charter of the year 1064; relating to the grant of the priory of Balbec to the abbey of Bernai, but it should seem that he belonged to another family.

when near his end became so infatuated by the injudicious counsels of his wife that, in conjunction with them, he took measures against the welfare of the community. He caused a fort to be built with the king's money on the territory of Anciens,[1] and following Eustace his lord employed himself in ravaging the lands of his neighbours, so that, old as he was, he had no shame at being ranked among the public enemies.

At this period, the observance of Lent was damnably violated by the sons of men.

Robert, son of Asceline Goël,[2] the first of the king's enemies who repented, being sorry for the rebellion into which he had plunged, implored the prince's favour; which being extended to him, he retained faithfully and advantageously to the end of his days, which was not far distant. Several others wisely followed his example.

The king also invited Amauri to make peace with him, promising that if he would surrender the citadel, he should occupy the whole county of Evreux without molestation. The count, being a turbulent man, absurdly rejected the offers voluntarily made him by the royal grace; and, having weighty grounds for hostilities in the loss of the inheritance of his ancestors, he hurried in breathless haste from one castle to another by night, keeping every one in continual commotion by his restless activity, encouraging his confederates, and warning them carefully to guard their fortresses, to be on the watch against crafty spies, and, making irruptions throughout the neighbourhood with prudence and activity, pillage everything but the churches, and put down by force of arms all opposition. Such were the hostilities which he indefatigably urged for the recovery of the county to which he was heir, but of which the king had deprived him. Ralph-the-Red[3] was generally his most formidable opponent, and the greatest obstacle to the success of his enterprises. He was a brave knight, experienced in the art of war, and had rendered himself illustrious for his courage and daring.

[1] Anceins, a very small commune near St. Evroult. Herbert d'Anceins sold the church and site to the monks at the same period just mentioned (vol. ii. 399). It would appear from what our author here states that la Ferté-Fresnel was built on the dismemberment of the domain of Anceins.

[2] Robert d'Ivri, eldest son of Asceline Goël, lord of Ivri and Bréval.

[3] Ralph-the-Red, lord of Pont-Echanfré.

On one occasion, when Lewis's army had made an irruption into the Vexin, and, as is the case in war, the French, being the strongest, put their enemies to flight, the horse of Richard, the king's son,[1] was killed under him, and the young prince was on the point of being made prisoner. Ralph, perceiving this, sprang from his horse without a moment's delay, and said to the king's son: "Mount instantly and flee, or you will be taken." The prince was scarcely gone when Ralph fell into the enemy's hands, but he was exchanged fifteen days afterwards for Wallon de Trie.[2] That knight was brother of Enguerrand de Trie, who, having been taken prisoner a short time before, languished and groaned in the strict confinement of the king's dungeons, and soon afterwards died of his wounds and the sufferings to which he had been exposed.[3] Ralph, who preserved his fealty, was honoured by the king, and thenceforth esteemed one of his principal and intimate friends, who promised him high promotion if he lived.

On another occasion, three lords of castles, Eustace,[4] Richer,[5] and William de la Ferté,[6] in Perche, assembled their forces and made an irruption into Normandy for the sake of plunder as far as the source of the Ternant,[7] setting fire to the houses in the village of Verneuces, on the domains of St. Evroult. Ralph, seeing the smoke from Pont Echanfré, where he then was, immediately collected troops from all quarters, and hastened to give the enemy battle, for the king had stationed thirty men-at-arms at Sap,[8] with as many at Orbec, to check the inroads of the freebooters, who assembled from all parts to pillage the country. Ralph, having drawn these together, attacked with this small band three hundred cavalry at the ford of the Charenton,[9] and, recovering the vast booty which they were

[1] Richard, the second of King Henry's natural sons, who was drowned in the wreck of the *Blanche-Nef*.

[2] Wallon de Trie, Enguerrand's eldest brother.

[3] Another instance of Henry's inhumanity. See the note, p. 426.

[4] Eustace de Breteuil. [5] Richer de Laigle.

[6] William Fresnel was the eldest son of Richard, who was too old to engage in this expedition.

[7] *Fontem Ternanti*. The Ternant gives its name to a hamlet a little below the church, and soon falls into the Guiel.

[8] A village near St. Evroult, the birthplace of one of the abbots.

[9] We suppose that Ralph-the-Red, marching from his castle at Pont-Echanfré, waited for the band of pillagers at the ford of Anciens.

carrying off, and taking some prisoners, pursued them as far as La Ferté Fresnel; and, unless this castle had offered them a near asylum, they would have suffered greater loss.

Not long afterwards, this same brave knight made an amicable appeal to the king, humbly representing the advantages of his only showing himself before Fresnel, the garrison of which were as cowardly as they were troublesome. In consequence, the king, at last, after Whitsuntide,[1] gave way to the earnest entreaties of Hugh, and was induced to appear before the fortress from which the devastations of the territory of St. Evroult were carried on. On the king's arrival the people of Fresnel were struck with panic, and in their alarm consulted together what was to be done; but Ralph-the-Red, of Pont-Echanfré, having vigorously assaulted the place, they laid the keys of the fortress at the king's feet, and, having submitted to his judgment on their rebellion, returned to their allegiance.

About the end of June, the old Richard came to St. Evroult, and, being ill, assumed the monastic habit. He died shortly afterwards in the beginning of July, and was buried in the monks' chapter-house, having given to the abbey one portion of the church of La Gonfrière[2] and the moiety of his tithes, and obtained from William, his eldest son, and his other children, the confirmation of his gift.

Ch. XIV. *The fortresses in Normandy garrisoned by King Henry—The Norman lords who adhered to him.*

While these numerous and violent storms were fiercely raging, King Henry stoutly maintained his regal authority, and strictly guarded all his own fortresses, carefully selecting trusty garrisons to whom he committed the custody, so that no hostile manœuvres might gain an entrance into them. Thus Rouen, the metropolis, Bayeux, Coutances, Avranches, Séez, Arques, Nonancourt, Illiers, Caen, Falaise, Exmes, Féchamp, Lillebonne, Vernon, Argentan, and other places under his dominion, were not subject to be wrested from him by insidious counsels. The loyal nobles, such as Richard, earl of Chester, Ranulph de Bricasard, his cousin and successor, Ralph de Conches, William de Warrenne, William de Roumare, William de Tankerville, Ralph de

[1] Whitsuntide fell that year on the 17th of May.

[2] Between Ferté-Fresnel and St. Evroult.

Saint-Victor,[1] Walter Giffard, Nigel d'Aubigni, and William his brother, with other great lords, adhered to the king both in prosperity and adversity, disdaining the distinctions to be acquired by treason and perjury. Waleran and Robert, the young sons of the earl of Mellent, were also faithful to their allegiance, and their vassals in their well-fortified castles obeyed all the royal commands, and stoutly resisted the incursions of his adversaries. Thus Pont-Audemer, Beaumont, Brionne, and Vatteville[2] remained true to the king, and their lords, with their dependants, served him faithfully in the wars with all their forces.

CH. XV. *Marriage of William, King Henry's eldest son, to the daughter of the count of Anjou—Henry does some acts of grace—Calls a council at Rouen, and burns a number of castles.*

IN the month of May, William the Etheling,[3] the king's son, crossed the sea from England to Normandy, and the king, rejoiced at seeing him, presently made known what he had already determined in his own mind. Sending envoys to propose peace to the count of Anjou, he made a treaty of amity with him on favourable terms, and graciously invited him to his court.

In the course of June, William the Etheling was married to the daughter of the count of Anjou at Lisieux. This illustrious union gave universal joy to all who were sighing for tranquillity; and, although the young prince's thread of life was soon broken in the depths of the sea, the marriage for the time gave needful repose to hostile nations. Then, at the count's request, Henry admitted to his favour William Talvas, son of Robert de Bèlesme, and restored to him the whole of his father's lands in Normandy. He granted to him Alençon, Almenèches, and Vignats, except the citadels,[4] which he reserved for garrisons of his own.

[1] Ralph de Saint-Victor must have belonged to the family of Mortimer. He was probably son of Ralph, and eldest brother of Hugh de Mortimer, the chief benefactor to the abbey of St. Victor.

[2] Vattevile is on the left bank of the Seine, opposite Caudebec, and on the verge of the forest of Brotonne.

[3] We have often had occasion to observe that this Anglo-Saxon title of the heir to the throne was adopted by the Normans.

[4] *Dangiones*, the donjons: a word sometimes adopted by English writers to describe the interior defences, the keep as it is also called, of a Norman castle.

Henry also, on the prayer of his son's father-in-law, pardoned his cousin,[1] Robert de St. Ceneri, for having lately revolted and gone over to the enemy, restoring to him Montreuil and Echaufour.[2]

The king called a meeting of the bishops and barons at Lisieux, and, informing them of the sudden death of Baldwin, earl of Flanders,[3] gave orders to the clergy that the bells should toll, and prayers be offered, for the absolution and repose of his soul. One party in Normandy rejoiced, and the other lamented, that the earl of Flanders, the king's bitterest enemy, was dead, and the count of Anjou, the lord of three cities,[4] had allied himself to the powerful monarch.

During the summer, after waiting long and using every means to persuade the traitors to repent of their perjury, King Henry made a terrible expedition through Normandy, and set fire to Pont Saint-Pierre[5] and other castles and vills of his enemies, taking severe revenge on them and their accomplices.

Ch. XVI. *An account of some extraordinary natural phenomena.*

In the midst of these events Almighty God made known his wonders on the earth, that he might touch the hearts of those who witnessed them and correct their iniquities. In the preceding winter there had been deluges of rain, so that the rivers overflowed and the inundations rose in the houses to an unusual height. In consequence the inhabitants of Rouen, Paris, and other cities, as well as of the country villages, beheld the waters of the Seine in flood inundating their houses and damaging the corn in their homesteads.

The following Lent, a strong wind blew over the Seine and dried it up for a time,[6] so that any one might cross it

[1] By his wife Adelaide. See vol. i. p. 426.

[2] Montreuil-l'Argillier, and Echaufour, near St. Evroult.

[3] The earl died on the 7th of June (see before p. 430), the council was, therefore, assembled about the end of that month.

[4] Probably Angers, Saumur, and Tours.

[5] It stood in the valley of the Andelle, and belonged to the lords of Breteuil. To account for its destruction by Henry I., we must suppose that it was still held by Eustace, but according to Ordericus (p. 467) Paci was the only castle he retained of all his paternal inheritance.

[6] The way in which Ordericus proposes to account for this phenomenon is very unsatisfactory. May it not rather be attributed to the level of the country having been raised by some internal convulsion, such as that which

from one bank to the other, if he had the courage to venture on so unusual a road. Paris was witness to this phenomenon, and was justly terrified by it.

In the month of August, the moon, in its first quarter, appeared in the evening red as blood, and its disc looked like the bottom of a large cask to people in France. Afterwards it was cut in two by a streak the colour of sapphire, and spectators beheld between the two equal moieties a space such as, if a similar occurrence took place on the earth, would be considered a human path. After the space of an hour, the moon again appeared entire, and, the ruddy hue gradually fading, her young crescent shone as it usually does.

At the same time a brilliant red light was observed shooting from Poissy by Mantes into Normandy, and during three nights this spectacle in the heavens was visible to many of the French. Those who witnessed it offered various interpretations, giving the turn that suited their own wishes to such as listened to their observations. The froward, in their folly, boasted of the future as well as the past, boldly affirming that King Lewis, who was then at Andelis with the French, would consume the Normans, like a flame, and reduce all Normandy to submission with his sharp-edged sword. The presumption of these arrogant men led them to interpret the prodigy with an insolence conformable to their own desires; but the event was very different from what they expected. Leaving this, I now proceed with the thread of my narrative.

CH. XVII. *Siege of Evreux by Henry I.—St. Saviour's abbey and the cathedral burnt down—The citadel surrenders—On hearing it, King Lewis breaks up the siege of Chateau-Neuf.*

KING Henry, determining to give no further indulgence to the rebels, entered the territory of Evreux and laid siege to that city at the head of a powerful army; but the garrison of the castle, joined by the citizens, making a stout resistance, he could not force an entrance. There were with him his son Richard, his nephew count Stephen, Ralph de Guader

on the 10th of October, 1144, dried most of the streams in the south of England, and even extended ten miles into the sea. These phenomena are worthy the consideration of geologists. The last is mentioned by several cotemporary historians, particularly Florence of Worcester and Brompton.

and a great force of Normans. The king having called them all together, thus addressed bishop Ouen: "You see, lord bishop, that we have been repulsed by the enemy, and there are no means of reducing them but by fire. But if we set the place on fire, the churches will be burnt and much injury be done to the innocent. Now therefore, as the pastor of this church, after careful consideration, tell us wisely what is best to be done. If, by God's help, the fire secures our success, by his aid we will repair the damages the church may receive, freely defraying the cost out of our own treasury, so that the house of God will, I think, be rebuilt, even better than it now is."

The prelate hesitated how he should reply in a case of so much difficulty. He was at a loss what to decide as most conformable to the divine will, and doubted what was best for him to desire and propose. At length, after consulting men of prudence, he gave permission for firebrands to be thrown in and the city given to the flames, in order that it might be delivered from excommunicated traitors and restored to its rightful owners. In consequence, Ralph de Guader set it on fire, on the north side first, and the flames spreading without obstacle in every quarter, as it was the dry season of autumn, caught all the buildings. The abbey of St. Saviour's, which belonged to nuns, was burnt to the ground, as well as the celebrated church of St. Mary, the glorious mother and Virgin, in which the bishop and clergy officiated and where the episcopal court of the diocese was held. The king and all his nobles humbly gave the bishop pledges, in consequence of the destruction of the churches by fire, promising him distinctly ample contributions from their wealth for the restoration of the buildings.

The prudent king had made peace with Robert Goël, as we have seen before, giving him the custody of the castle of Ivri to secure his fidelity, and receiving his brothers as hostages for his good behaviour. Ralph-the-Red was the serviceable mediator of this pacific agreement, being the knight's brother-in-law, and thus bound to him by the strictest ties. Before his expedition to Evreux, the king had given orders to Goël to attack Amauri and his countrymen in arms, and manœuvre along the course of the Eure, near Ivri. He fixed an appointed day on which these operations should be commenced. Ralph obeyed the king's commands in every

particular, and the affair turned out according to Henry's wishes. At length, seeing the city entirely in flames, he despatched a messenger to Roger Goël with the intelligence of the event. Thereupon Robert shouted in the thick of the fight: "My lord Amauri, listen to the news I will tell you, which will bring you nothing but grief. The king has burnt to-day the city of Evreux, and the garrison of the citadel are in fear of instant death." On hearing this, Amauri collected his troops, and returned home sorrowing for the ruin of his city.

Philip and Florus,[1] sons of Philip, king of France, and Amauri's nephews by his sister Bertrade, William Pointel, Richard of Evreux, son of Fulk the provost, and several other brave knights, defended the citadel. After the city was burnt their resistance was more secure and bold, for since the citizens had fled there was less to protect. The inhabitants of the ruined city dispersed themselves in all quarters, and having lost all they possessed, were forced to wander in wretchedness among the cottages of strangers. The king, with his usual moderation, sent word to the garrison that if they would surrender the citadel he would pardon all their transgressions, adding many other promises; and as they accepted his terms he hastened to take in hand other state affairs. However, he returned shortly afterwards in the night, at the head of a strong body of troops, and before dawn, with lighted torches, began to fortify his camp, and having completed the works he entrusted it to some brave warriors. Ralph-the-Red and Simon de Molines[2] were appointed to the command, with Gilbert d'Exmes and several others of approved valour. The king placed great confidence in them, employing them to check the enemy's irruptions and recover the country which had been taken from him.

Amauri,[3] Eustace,[4] Odo de Gometz,[5] Guy de Malvoisin,[6] and other valiant knights, were stationed there and paid

[1] Philip, count de Mantes, and Fleuri, who married the heiress of Bangis, were nephews of Amauri de Montfort as sons of his sister Bertrade.

[2] Simon, lord of Moulins-la-Marche, after his brother Robert, was son of William de Moulins, by his second wife Duda, daughter of Robert earl of Mellent.

[3] Amauri de Montfort.

[4] Eustace de Breteuil.

[5] Odo de Gometz, probably Gometz-le-Châtel.

[6] Guy Mauvoisin, lord of Boissi-Mauvoisin, deserved his name, for he was indeed a very bad neighbour.

visits to their brethren in arms with great daring and courage, encouraging them by their presence, and frequently disturbing the royal camp by sharp attacks. The king's troops were never taken by surprise, always anticipating the manœuvres of their insidious foe and meeting their adversaries, fierce as lions, ready armed with coats of mail and helmets, and exchanging blows gallantly with sword and spear. No one would yield to his antagonist, but each burned to distinguish himself; so that many fell in these daily encounters. There the knight, named William, son of Roger de St. Lawrence, was slain, and his body was interred in the church of St. Victor the Martyr.[1] He was of a noble house of the most illustrious barons of the district of Caux, and his bravery was often extolled among the greatest warriors of the Talou. In this manner much blood was shed in these constant feats of arms, and the cruel loss of life among the flower of the Norman youth was the cause of deep sorrow to numbers.

King Lewis laid siege to the castle of Dangu, and French volour closely straitened the governor Robert.[2] At last, by the advice of some friends among the besiegers, he set the place on fire, and marching out left the enemy nothing but its ashes. The same week, putting himself at the head of the troops of Gisors,[3] he made a sudden attack on the French, and carried off much booty from Chaumont and the neighbouring villages. The king of France, greatly elated at the burning of Dangu, sat down before Chateau-Neuf,[4] a castle which William Rufus built at Fuscelmont on the river Epte, but he did not obtain the success he desired. Walter Riblard made a vigorous resistance with the troops of King Henry, severely wounding the assailants with discharges of

[1] In the charter of Hugh de Mortemer in favour of the abbey of St. Victor, we find the names of Adam de St. Lawrence, his mother Mabel, and his two sons William and Roger, both as benefactors and witnesses. St. Victor-en-Caux, in the arrondissement of Dieppe. It was converted from a priory to an abbey in 1074.

[2] It is not supposed that he was one of the family of Crispin, but a commandant appointed by the king.

[3] Gisors, a strong frontier fortress of Normandy on the Epte below St. Clair and Dangu. Our author is right in stating that it was built by William Rufus, although Du Plessis, in his *Description de la Haute Normandie*, attributes it to Henry II.

[4] Chateauneuf-sur-Epte, near St. Clair on the same river, but on the right bank.

arrows. At the end of fifteen days Amauri despatched a messenger to King Lewis informing him that Evreux had been reduced to ashes, and that he had suffered other disasters; and earnestly demanding instant succour. On receiving this intelligence the king withdrew from the siege, burning his soldiers' huts, to the great joy of the enemy. Then Enguerrand de Trie, a very brave knight, was wounded in the brow, and some days afterwards, having lost his reason, died miserably.

CH. XVIII. *The battle of Brémule, or Noyon, between Henry of England and Lewis of France—Soon after his defeat Lewis makes a second irruption into Normandy, but retreats at the approach of Henry's army.*

MEANWHILE King Lewis effected his retreat into France with the utmost expedition, but quickly counter-marched from Etampes into Normandy, attended by some brave knights. On the twentieth day of the month of August, King Henry having heard mass at Noyon marched out with his principal nobles on an expedition against the French, not knowing that the king of France had arrived at Andeli.[1] The king of England rode at the head of a gallant troop of men-at-arms, and caused the harvest in the fields[2] about Etrepagni to be reaped by his rapacious soldiery, giving orders that great sheaves of corn should be carried on the backs of their horses to the castle of Lions. Four knights were stationed by the king on the top of Verclive,[3] to keep watch against any opposition that might be offered to his enterprise. These sentinels, observing the helmets and standards of troops moving towards Noyon, gave immediate notice to King Henry.

[1] Henry did not put himself in marching order until he heard that Lewis had retired. As long as he thought that Lewis-le-Gros was in the Vexin, he prudently shut himself up at Rouen, although fire and pillage were carried within four miles of his capital city. The king of France, notwithstanding his corpulence, for which he is jeered by the Norman writers, was become very active.

[2] It may be thought strange that on the 20th of August the corn should be still standing on the plains of the Vexin; but it must be recollected that there, as well as elsewhere during the middle ages, it principally consisted of late crops, barley and oats.

[3] This place standing on an isolated hill, near Écouis, commands the whole plain of the Norman Vexin to a vast distance.

The same day King Lewis marched from Andeli with the French army, making frequent complaints to his attendants that they could not meet with the king of England in an open field, not knowing that the king was close at hand. Lewis rode in haste with his brilliant cavalry towards Noyon, expecting that the castle would be given up to him the same day, by a concerted treason, but the affair turned out very differently. Victory did not favour those who were swelling with pride and eager for the fight, but routed and put them to flight when they were exulting in the prospect of triumph. Burchard de Montmorenci,[1] and some other prudent men, dissuaded Lewis from fighting in Normandy, but the people of Chaumont urged him furiously to give battle. William the chamberlain[2] also tried to prevent Henry from enagging in the conflict, but William de Warrenne[3] and Roger de Bienfaite[4] gave him great encouragement.

At last, it was generally understood, by the exchange of messengers, and by rumours which spread the intelligence far and wide, that both kings were in presence at the head of their armies, and, if they wished, battle might be joined. The French had by this time reached the neighbourhood of Noyon, and had set fire to a granary belonging to the monks of Boucheron,[5] the smoke of which was visible to the English as it rose in the air. Near Mount Verclive there is an open ground and vast plain, called by the inhabitants of the country Brémule.[6] King Henry descended to it with five hundred cavalry, the warlike hero having put on his armour and skilfully disposed his mailed troops. He

[1] Bouchard III. de Montmorenci. He was still living in the year 1124.

[2] William de Tankerville (the Normans spelt the name Tancarville), the same person who the year before stopped Henry's expedition against Laigle by a false alarm.

[3] William de Warrenne, second of that name, earl of Surrey.

[4] Roger de Bienfaite, lord of Hommet, which he received in exchange for Brionne.

[5] The foundation of this priory, which was a cell of St. Evroult, is mentioned before, p. 419. Our author here speaks of a grange which stood on the plain.

[6] This plain belongs to the commune of Gaillard bois, and is traversed by the public road from Rouen to Paris. To the south of this road lies the farm of Brémule which appears to have been the central point of the battle, and gave it its name, at least in the French accounts; some English historians, calling it the battle of Noyon, Henry's head quarters,

had with him his two sons, Robert and Richard, illustrious knights, and three counts, Henry d'Eu, William de Warrenne, and Walter Giffard. The king was also supported by Roger, son of Roger, and Walter d'Aufay, his own cousins,[1] as well as by William de Tankerville, William de Roumare, Nigel d'Aubigni, and several others who may be compared to the Scipios, the Mariuses, and the Catos, the Roman censors, for their civil virtues and knightly valour, as the result proved. Edward of Salisbury[2] carried the standard, whose approved intrepidity was in high renown, and never failed him even when fighting to the death.

Lewis having come in sight of what he had long desired, called up four hundred knights, who were ready close at hand, and exhorted them to do battle valiantly in defence of justice and the liberty of the kingdom, and not to suffer the glory of the French arms to be tarnished by their cowardice. There, William Clito, the son of Robert, duke of Normandy, armed himself for the liberation of his father from his long imprisonment, and the recovery of the dominions of his ancestors. There also, Matthew, count de Beaumont,[3] Guy de Clermont,[4] Osmund de Chaumont,[5] William de Garlande, seneschal of France,[6] Peter de Maule,[7] Philip de Mont-Brai,[8]

three leagues distant. Duchesne's text calls the place Brenneville, but the original MS. gives the right name BRENMULA.

Near it, in the commune of Verclive, is a spot called Le Coupe-Gueule, from some incident in the engagement.

[1] Walter d'Aufay was Henry's cousin in two ways; by his great grandmother Papia, sister of Duke Robert I., and by his mother Beatrix, cousin of Queen Matilda. Walter was probably the third son of the Walter d'Aufay and Avicia, some account of whom, with their epitaphs, is given in vol. ii. pp. 268—270.

[2] This person had large possessions at Salisbury and in that neighbourhood. His daughter Matilda, by order of William Rufus, married Humphrey de Bohun, who had in her right part of their vast domains. The rest were inherited by Edward's son, Walter of Salisbury.

[3] Matthew I., count of Beaumont-sur-Oise, chamberlain of France.

[4] Guy de Clermont, second son of Hugh I., count de Clermont.

[5] Osmond de Chaumont, husband of the heiress of Quitri.

[6] William de Garlande, second of that name, seneschal of France.

[7] Peter de Maule, second of that name, who married the daughter of Manasses, count de Guines. See vol. ii. p. 233.

[8] For Philip de Montbrai, the reading should be Paganus de Montjai. It is the more singular that our author should have mistaken the name of this person in the present instance, as he has properly named him not long before (b. x. c. iv. p. 211). His chief seat, as before remarked was at Montjai, near Villevaude, and his real name was Alberic or Aubrey, but he

and Burchard de Montmorenci, prepared themselves for the battle. Of the Normans, there were Baldric de Brai,[1] William Crispin,[2] and some others in the ranks of the French army. All these assembled at Brémule, swelling with pride and ready to encounter the Normans.

In this battle the first charge was made by the French with great gallantry, but as they advanced without order, they were soon overpowered and turned to flight. Richard the king's son, and a hundred horse were drawn out in battle array, but the rest with the king held the field on foot. William Crispin with eighty knights, who rode in the van, made the first attack on the Normans, but their horses being soon killed, they were all surrounded and held in check. Then Godfrey de Perans, with the troops of the Vexin, made a resolute assault, which caused the English army to stagger and fall back a little, but those veteran warriors soon recovered their courage and strength, and Burchard, Osmond, and Alberic de Mareuil,[3] and several others, being thrown from their horses, were taken prisoners. The French perceiving this, said to the king: "Eighty of our knights, who were in the van of the army, are nowhere to be seen. The enemy is more than our match in numbers and strength. Burchard, Osmond, and some others of our best knights, are already taken; our troops are generally giving way, and their ranks are thinned. Retreat, my lord, we pray, ere we are exposed to irreparable ruin."

At these words Lewis consented to retire, and himself fled at a gallop with Baudri-du-Bois.[4] The victors took one

appears under that of Paganus de Mont-Gaio in the chartulary of the priory of Long-Pont. He was taken prisoner by the Normans, as we have already seen, in 1097, and he formed an alliance with Count Theobald, against Lewis-le-Gros, in 1112, but reaped nothing from that war but the loss of his castle of Livri, near Méluen, which, we are told, caused him much regret. He died before the year 1127, and Henry de Châtillon, the wife of his daughter Ermengarde, assumed the title of lord of Montjai, which his posterity preserved for a long period.

[1] Baudri de Bray has been already noticed. This place, situate on an island in the Epte, made part of Normandy and the department of the Eure till 1812 or 1813.

[2] William Crispin, or Crespin, was lord of Étrepagni.

[3] Probably Alberic de Rouci, viscount of Mareuil-sur-Marne, nephew of Beatrix de Rouci, countess of Mortagne.

[4] Probably the same person Ordericus has just called Baudri de Brai.

hundred and forty prisoners, and pursued the rest to the very gates of Andeli. The French troops, who had advanced with pomp by the high road, now fled in confusion by various by-ways. William Crispin who, with his followers, had been surrounded as before mentioned, having caught sight of King Henry whom he mortally hated, charged at him through the throng of combatants and struck him fiercely on the head with his sword, but the chevet of the illustrious prince's hauberk warded off the blow. Roger,[1] Richard's son, instantly bore the bold assailant to the earth, and throwing himself upon him protected him from the king's friends who would have killed him on the spot in revenge for the insult. But so many thronged upon Richard that he had great difficulty in saving his fallen adversary. It was a criminal and audacious act to raise the hand and strike with the sword the head which had been anointed by the ministry of the bishop with the holy chrism, and on which the royal crown had been placed amidst the acclamations of the people, lauding and giving thanks to the Lord God.[2]

In the battle between the two kings, in which nearly nine hundred knights were engaged, I have ascertained that three only were slain. This arose from their being entirely covered with steel armour, and mutually sparing each other for the fear of God and out of regard for the fraternity of arms, and aimed less at killing the fugitives than making them prisoners. Christian warriors, they did not thirst for their brothers' blood, but exulted in the victory which God gave them for the good of holy church and the security of the faithful. The brave Guy, Osmond, Burchard, and William Crispin, with several others, were taken on the field, as I have said before, and conducted to Noyon, where the English army retired the same day. Noyon is three leagues from Andeli, and at that time the whole country was a desert in consequence of the wars which raged so furiously. It was in the plain between the two places that the princes suddenly met, and the combatants shouted their war-cries, and the clash of arms was heard, and noble barons bit the dust.

There was a fief called du Bos, or du Bosc, in the commune of Baudemont, and the lords of Brai often assumed that name.

[1] Roger de Bienfaite.

[2] Henry of Huntingdon's account of this battle for the most part corresponds with our author's, but it supplies some additional details. See *Bohn's Antiq. Lib.* pp. 247, 248.

The king of France in his solitary flight lost his way in a wood,[1] but he lighted by chance on a peasant to whom his person was unknown. The king earnestly entreated him, adding many promises to which he pledged himself on his oath, to show him the nearest road to Andeli, or to be his guide to the town, for a great reward. Sure of being well recompensed, the peasant consented to conduct the trembling prince, who feared as much meeting some traveller who might betray him, as being overtaken by the pursuing enemy, who would make him prisoner. At last the peasant, seeing the royal guard respectfully coming from Andeli to meet the prince, making light of the reward he obtained, was much grieved at finding what a vast recompense he had lost from his ignorance of the rank of the person he saved.

King Henry purchased the standard of King Lewis from the soldier who took it for twenty silver marks,[2] and kept it as a memorial of the victory Heaven had granted him. The next day he sent back Lewis's charger, with the saddle and bridle and all the equipments, as became a king. William the Etheling also returned his palfrey to William Clito his cousin, and at the instance of his prudent father added other presents serviceable to an exile. The king dispersed his prisoners, sending them for custody to different castles; Burchard, Hervey de Gisors,[3] and some others who were vassals of both kings, he did not reserve for ransom, but liberated at once. The illustrious Guy of Chaumont fell sick at Rouen, where he died, to the king's grief who had kept the gallant warrior in prison. Osmond, the wicked old knight, was conducted to Arques,[4] and, bound in chains and fetters as he deserved, was closely confined till peace was restored between the sovereigns. His infamy in protecting thieves and robbers, to give greater scope to their iniquities, reached the ears of people in Illyrium. He even did not

[1] Probably in the woods of Musegros.

[2] According to M. Delisle's calculation, before referred to, the silver mark being worth fifty-two francs, the sum paid was equivalent to 1040 francs.

[3] Hervey de Gisors was son of Theobald Paganus, to whom Robert Curthose restored the castle of Gisors, which was taken from him by Henry I. It may be conceived that the king of England might consider him as half-Norman, half-French, but the same observation is inapplicable to Bouchard de Montmorenci, who held nothing, as far as we know, under Henry.

[4] The castle of Arques.

scruple to strip pilgrims, paupers, widows, and defenceless monks and clerks, tormenting them without remorse in various ways.

Peter de Maule and other fugitives threw away their cognizances[1] to escape recognition, and adroitly mixing with their pursuers joined in their cries of triumph, and sounded the praises of King Henry and his troops with pretended satisfaction. Robert de Courci, the younger,[2] followed up the French into the heart of the burgh, where he was seized in the throng of fugitives, mistaking them for his own party. He was the only Norman taken; and that, not in escaping like a coward, but, alone in the enemy's town, he was surrounded by numbers and thrust into prison.

The news of the disaster which had befallen the French in Normandy spread far and wide, and the intelligence was received in all the provinces on this side the Alps either with sorrow or joy. Those who had exalted themselves were covered with shame, and the combatants present in the battle sought various pretexts in reply to the scorn which was heaped upon them, and forged different falsehoods, according to circumstances in excuse of their disgrace.

CH. XIX. *The French make a fresh irruption into Normandy —King Lewis, foiled before Breteuil, returns to France.*

KING Lewis returned to Paris sorrowing for the loss of the one hundred and forty knights he had gaily led to Noyon and who were now captives. Amauri,[3] who was not present in the battle, went to comfort him, and when the king lamented the rout and imprisonment of his soldiers, and gave a full account of the affair, Amauri said: "Let not my lord afflict himself for this disaster, as such are the chances of war, and they have often been the lot of the most celebrated generals. Fortune is like a revolving wheel; it overturns in a moment those whom it has suddenly raised, and on the other hand frequently lifts higher those it has prostrated and rolled in the dust. Now, therefore, taking into your consideration the resources of France, collect an

[1] *Cognitiones.* This passage bears on the disputed question of the period at which armorial ensigns came into use as personal distinctions. It looks very like their having been borne in this battle.

[2] Robert, second of that name, lord of Courci, near Croissanville.

[3] Amauri de Montfort.

immense force from all quarters, profit by the sound advice I give you to exert yourself to repair the losses inflicted on our reputation and power. Let the bishops and counts and other lords of the realm be rallied round you, and the priests with the whole body of their parishioners march under your standard, that an army of the commons may avenge our wrongs on the common enemy. For my part, although I did not take any part in your late expedition, I will join you with all my vassals and render you counsel and aid, with safe guidance.

"I have fortified a house at Cintrai,[1] where Walkelin de Tannei[2] and other faithful friends expect my arrival, and defend the neighbouring country on my behalf against the garrison of Breteuil. We can assemble there in security, and from thence an attack may be made on Breteuil, which is in the heart of Normandy. If we can reduce that fortress, we will restore Eustace, who was disinherited for having espoused our cause; and my nephew, Ralph de Conches, will be on our side with all his vassals and fortresses. He is in possession of the strong castles of Conches, Toëni, Portes,[3] and Acquigni, and well-tried barons hold under him, who alone will greatly augment our force. Ralph is now shut up in Breteuil, and does not at present render us any assistance, because he is afraid that by so doing he may expose his territories to devastation." Encouraged by this discourse the king resolved to act according to the advice given him by the lord of whom we are speaking. Accordingly, he despatched messengers in all haste to convey his summons to the bishops. They cheerfully obeyed the royal commands, and issued sentences of excommunication against all the priests in their dioceses, and their parishioners, who should not hasten to join the king's expedition on the day appointed, and use all their efforts to crush the refractory Normans.

[1] Citrai, near Breteuil.

[2] There are a number of places in Normandy bearing the name of Tannei, particularly four between Orbec and Broglie, and four hamlets near St. Evroult. Our author mentions in his *thirteenth* book, under the date of 1138, a person named Alan de Taneto, who had lands at Cisai, in the latter district, as well as, it would appear, near Pont-Audemer in the former, and it is conjectured that he was the father of the Walkelin de Tannei here mentioned.

[3] Portes, near Conches. The other places have been already mentioned.

In consequence, the people of Burgundy, Berri, Auvergne[1] and Champagne, with those of the territory of Paris, and Orleans, the Vermandois, the Beauvoisis, Laon, the Gatinois, and many others, flew to arms with eagerness, like wolves to their prey, and had scarcely left their homes when they began to pillage all that they could lay hands on in their own country. The disorderly multitude was so bent on rapine, that they profanely robbed the churches on their road, and treated the monks and clergy, who were their own countrymen, as if they had been enemies. The royal authority was of no avail in executing justice on these marauders; episcopal censure was benumbed, and every one did what he would, as chance suggested, with impunity. The bishops of Noyon, Laon, and several others, were present at this expedition, but such was their hatred of the Normans that they permitted their people to commit every sort of outrage. They even allowed consecrated places to be violated, under the colour of their divine authority, that this licence might increase the number of their followers, and that by winking at their proceedings, good or bad, they might be encouraged against the enemy.

Under these circumstances, King Lewis assembled at Breteuil[2] vast bodies of men from Péronne, Nesle, Noyon, Lille, Tournai, Arras, Gournai, Clermont,[3] and all the provinces of France and Flanders, prepared to restore to Eustace all he had lost, and to reinstate in their former possessions the other banished lords who were adherents of William the exile. Ralph the Breton[4] with his troops boldly opposed the march of the enemy, engaging them with vigour, and causing them lamentable losses by the fierce blows dealt on them with lance and sword. He caused all the gates of the castle to be thrown open at their approach, but no one ventured to force his way through the open doors, the astonishing courage of their opponents sufficiently repelling them. The battle raged furiously outside the three gates, and brave warriors fell in great numbers on both sides.

[1] This levy *en masse* was tumultuous enough without the people of Burgundy, Berri, and Auvergne, who must be erased from the list.

[2] We shall find that this siege commenced on the 17th of September.

[3] It will be observed that the only forces specified are those from places subject to the king, or Flemings engaged in the cause of the Pretender.

[4] Ralph de Guader, here called Ralph the Breton, because he was a native of Gael or Guader in Brittany.

The king of England, receiving intelligence of this fresh inroad of the French into Normandy, despatched his son Richard with two hundred knights to the relief of Ralph de Guader, giving directions to the bold and active knights, Ralph-the-Red and Rualod d'Avranches,[1] to conduct their march. The royal troops arrived while the fight was hottest, and, upon their being observed, the French who were already exhausted, began to give way. The gallant Ralph flew from gate to gate, frequently changing his armour that he might not be recognized. He bore down that day several distinguished warriors, and having dismounted them, bestowed their horses on such of his comrades as needed them, thus gaining glory through all ages, among the bravest soldiers, by his prowess in arms.

A Fleming, remarkable for his fine person and gallant bearing, struck to the ground Ralph-the-Red, Luke de Barre,[2] and other valiant knights, exulting with much arrogance in taking their horses, but he was not wise enough to foresee the melancholy fate which speedly awaited him. He attacked the intrepid Breton without the usual precaution, mistaking him for a common soldier, but it was not long before Ralph gave him a mortal wound which brought him to the ground, and being made prisoner in the presence of many spectators, he was thrown into the dungeon at Breteuil, where he died fifteen days afterwards.

The king of England, with a great body of troops, followed his son Richard and the others he had despatched in advance, prepared to fight another battle against the many thousands in the French army, if he found them on his territories. They had expected to reduce the fortress by the length of their siege, but the hopes they entertained were frustrated the same day they marched to the place full of arrogance, and they were forced to retreat into France, repulsed with shame

[1] Rualod seems to be a Breton form of the name Roland. This person, son of William d'Avranches, acquired by his marriage with Matilda de Mandeville the lordship of Folkstone in Kent, and, according to our English genealogists, was living in 1147. A charter of his wife Matilda and another of his son William, are given in the *Monasticon Anglicanum*. The family did not become extinct in England till a late period of the thirteenth century.

[2] Luke, lord of la Barre in Ouche. We shall presently find King Henry putting out the eyes of this troubadour knight for having treated him satirically in his poetical compositions.

and loss. By God's just judgment, the priests returned inglorious, and overwhelmed with fears, losses, sorrow, and confusion, because they had suffered the consecrated places, which they ought to have protected by ecclesiastical censures, to be defiled and indecently violated by greedy robbers.

Then William de Chaumont, the king's son-in-law,[1] and several aspiring youths, irritated at having gained nothing at Breteuil, made an incursion, to the number of two hundred, towards the castle of Tillières, to obtain for themselves either profit or glory. However Gilbert, the castellan of Tillières,[2] lay in ambush with his people in a place of concealment, watching all the roads that his farms might not be pillaged by these freebooters. When the French came up he suddenly burst upon them from his ambuscade, and made William, the king's son-in-law, his prisoner; for whose ransom he received two hundred silver marks. He also took some of his comrades, and put the rest shamefully to flight.

France was in great distress when she found the pride of her sons humbled, and reckoned her losses, the shame of future generations, recently sustained in Normandy. King Henry, however, the lover of peace, was crowned with glory, God having graciously listened to the prayers of the church on his behalf, and given him repeated victories over his enemies. Restored prosperity favoured him with her smiles, while she struck the cruel robbers with alarm, and caused the public enemies bitter repentance for their fruitless revolt.

[1] This royal alliance of William de Chaumont, which was long considered doubtful, has been fully confirmed by a document in the chartulary of St. Peter at Chartres, lately published by M. Guérard (t. ii. p. 640). It is dated the 9th of April preceding (1119), and it appears from it that the marriage took place late in 1117.

It is clear that the lady must have been a natural daughter of Lewis-le-Gros, as that prince only married Adelaide de Maurienne in 1115, and his former marriage with Lucienne was dissolved without having been consummated.

In the chartulary of St. Wandrille there is a charter, unhappily without date, from which it appears that Osmond II. of Chaumont had two sons, William and Osmond III., who were grandsons of Nicholai de Quetre. The Norman writers, with Ordericus, spell the name improperly, Otmond.

[2] Gilbert Crispin, castellan of Tillières. Ordericus always spells this name Crespin, and is followed by his French editors; but it is better known to the English reader under the form adopted in this translation.

CH. XX. *A freebooter's reverence for a way-side cross—King Henry restores order in the district of Ouche.*

RICHER DE LAIGLE carried off Odo from Cisai,[1] with all the booty he found there, on the fifteenth of the calends of October [17th September], the day on which the king appeared before Breteuil with so many thousands troops, and reaped nothing but dishonour and wounds. That young soldier performed an action in this expedition which is worthy of being handed down to future ages. While the inhabitants of Gacé and the neighbouring villages were in pursuit of the robbers, considering by what means they might regain their cattle, either by force or ransom, the bold troopers, facing about, charged them, and soon putting them to the rout, pursued them in turn. The peasants having no means of defending themselves against an armed band, nor any strong place in which they could take refuge, and seeing a wooden cross by the side of the road, all prostrated themselves together before it. Richer, perceiving this, struck with the fear of God, and touched with tender love for his Saviour, piously reverenced his cross. He therefore commanded his party to permit these trembling creatures to remain safe; while, in order that they might suffer no injury, his own troops continued their march. Thus, from fear of his Creator, the noble youth spared nearly a hundred peasants, from whom he might have exacted a considerable ransom if he had recklessly ventured to seize them. The same week he was reconciled with the king, through the mediation of his uncle Rotrou,[2] and recovered all his father's lands both in England and Normandy.

Then the king, at the head of his troops, visited the district of Ouche, and marched against his enemies who held Glos and Lire. At that time Roger, son of William, who was son of Barnon,[3] commanded at Glos, and Arnold du Bois[4] was

[1] Cisai, near Gacé, mentioned in a preceding note.

[2] Rotrou II. count de Perche.

[3] Respecting William de Glos, son of Barnon, see vol. ii. p. 516; where a not very flattering portrait is drawn of this servant of the house of Breteuil. Our author there mentions his wife Beatrix and his son Roger, the person here referred to.

[4] This family, which has left its name to the commune du Bois-Arnaud in the canton of Rugles, was one of the oldest attached to the lords of Breteuil. As early as the charter of foundation of Lire by William Fitz-Osberne, we find these Arnolds holding the rank of their stewards. Four

castellan of Lire. These men, perceiving that the king's power crushed all who resisted him, and that every hope of success from Eustace and Amauri failed, conferred with Ralph,[1] who was their neighbour, and, having obtained favourable terms from the king through his intervention, surrendered the castles they had so long faithfully guarded. The king restored them to Ralph de Guader, and the country about Ouche being thus restored to tranquillity, he returned to Rouen where he offered thanks to God.

Meanwhile, Ralph de Guader, who had his suspicions of Ralph de Conches, and could not visit his own domains on the other side of the Seine without crossing Guader's territories, granted him Pont-St.-Pierre and the valley of Pitres,[2] under fealty to himself, and an engagement to defend the state against the public enemy with all his forces. The king also gave the rents of Glos to Ralph-the-Red, having found his services useful on many occasions, and calculating that he might rely on them in time to come.

generations of this family are included among the benefactors to the collegiate church of Leicester, founded in 1107 for regular canons by Robert earl of Mellent.

[1] The same Ralph-the-Red, lord of Echaufré, so often mentioned. His castle was about three leagues from Lire, but only two from Glos.

[2] On the left bank of the Seine, near its junction with the Andelle.

END OF VOL. III.

J. MADDON AND SON, PRINTERS, CASTLE STREET, FINSBURY.

BROOKLYN PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 4444 07017 2309

BROOKLYN PUBLIC LIBRARY
CENTRAL SERVICE
GRAND ARMY PLAZA
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11238